



**Queen's University
Library**

KINGSTON, ONTARIO



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Queen's University Archives

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY

VOLUME XXXVII

1930

Published by the Publishing Committee
of Queen's Quarterly, Queen's
University, Kingston



213.41
v. 37
1930

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXVII

WINTER, 1930

REVISING THE CONSTITUTION, John W. Dafoe	1
THE SEA IN FICTION, Morley Roberts	18
HERMAN MELVILLE, Mary C. Ritchie	36
LA POLITIQUE FRANCAISE, Pierre Bernus	62
THE FOUNDING OF EDMONTON, Hon. Frank Oliver	78
HIVERNANTS, Eileen B. Thompson	95
IS "CIVILIZED WARFARE" POSSIBLE?, C. P. Stacey	105
THE BASKET OF EGGS (Poem), Wilfrid Gibson	122
HISTORY AND THE NEW BIOGRAPHY, Lionel M. Gelber.....	127
THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN UPPER CANADA (1791-1841)	
A. H. Young	145
THE KYOTO CONFERENCE, Lawrence J. Burpee	167
CENTRAL EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION, F. W. Baumgartner...	183
CURRENT EVENTS, J. A. Stevenson; M. Grattan O'Leary.....	192
BOOK REVIEWS	214

SPRING, 1930

THE NAVAL CONFERENCE, George Glasgow	225
THE LAST RISING, Sir Andrew Macphail	246
NIETZSCHE, Barker Fairley	259
VERSE, Rowland Thirlmere	276
THE SENSITIVENESS OF CANADIANS, B. K. Sandwell	279
PENTECOST IN LEGEND AND HISTORY, N. Micklem.....	292
THE DIARY OF FRANCIS DICKENS, Vernon LaChance.....	312
SCOTT, CARLYLE, DICKENS, AND CANADA, Frank Yeigh....	335
VERSE, X.	348
TEN YEARS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS, Frederic Soward	350
WHEAT IN THE CANADIAN WEST, T. W. Grindley.....	370
THE CONTROL OF DISEASE, Dr. J. H. McDermot	386
CURRENT EVENTS, Frederick C. Mears; Tom King	397
BOOK REVIEWS	413

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXXVII—(*Continued*)

SUMMER, 1930

INDIA AND THE SIMON REPORT, J. L. Morison	429
WHAT ARE CANADIANS MAKING OF THEIR COUNTRY? ✓	
J. Mackintosh Bell	437
PENELOPE'S TREES (Verse), John Drinkwater	446
POPULAR BELIEFS IN SHAKESPEARE'S DAY, Winifred	
Mary Stevens	449
JUDICIAL APPEALS TO THE PRIVY COUNCIL:	
1. THE CASE FOR DISCONTINUING APPEALS, John S.	
Ewart, K. C.	456
2. THE CASE FOR APPEALS, George H. Sedgewick, K.C.....	474
3. MR. EWART'S REPLY	490
THE RAVEN AND THE SUN, Robert Ayre	495
A SIXTEENTH CENTURY BLACK LIST, E. C. Kyte	514
THE WEE BROON MAN (Verse), Robert Watson	530
POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE LONDON CONFERENCE,	
Robert A. MacKay	532
THE PROVINCES AND THE SUPREMACY OF THE TREATY	
POWER, B. K. Sandwell	543
THE CASE AGAINST IMMIGRATION, R. M. Lower	557
CURRENT EVENTS	575
BOOK REVIEWS	593

AUTUMN, 1930

GEORGE GISSING, Morley Roberts	617
THE GREEK MYSTERIES, John Watson	633
CO-OPERATIVE GOVERNMENT IN CANADA, J. S. Woods-	
worth, M.P.	648
CANADA LOOKS AT THE BOOK CLUBS, William McRae	
Fawcett	656
RETURNING; OCTOBER DAYS, A. M. Stephen	666
THE PRIVY COUNCIL AND MINORITY RIGHTS, F. R. Scott..	668 ✓
THE SILVER FLUTE, M. M. H.	678
BRITAIN AND PALESTINE, A. E. Prince	679
TRAVELLING WITH THE SIMCOES, Frank Yeigh	698
TAYVILLE: SKETCHES OF AN ONTARIO TOWN IN THE	
'NINETIES, J. K. Robertson	711
THE CLAIMS OF FRENCH-CANADIAN POETRY, E. K. Brown	724
THE HOUSE OF BARINGS AND CANADA, George E. Shortt...	732
THE TIGER, W. M. Conacher	744
CURRENT EVENTS	762
BOOK REVIEWS	785

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY

WINTER, 1930

REVISING THE CONSTITUTION

BY JOHN W. DAFOE

THERE will be no attempt in this article to convince any reader by argument that there should be machinery available for the ready amendment of the British North America Act, which is the written part of our constitution, as the need for it arises. The mind to which this is not a self-evident proposition is closed to argument.

If the need is admitted, the Canadian people might take under consideration the circumstance that, if views put forth in recent years by public men are sound, Canada is unique among the countries of the world in being encased in a straight-jacket constitution made over sixty years ago from which there is no possibility of escape. In this respect we are civilized to the level of the ancient Medes and Persians. The procedure to be followed in amending the constitution, as set forth by the late Sir George Ross in *The Senate of Canada*, is as follows: first the consent of all the provinces must be obtained; then there must be a joint address by the Houses of Parliament;

and final ratification by the Parliament of Great Britain. This doctrine, put forward in 1914, has been accepted by most of the public men of both Dominion parties; it has been given the formal blessing of Mr. Lapointe, the Minister of Justice; there has been practical acceptance of its implications by the Dominion government. The formula, instead of being known as the work of the late Senator, is regarded by many as written on tablets of stone and handed down to posterity by the Fathers of Confederation.

The procedure, as outlined, will make it forever impossible to modify in any respect whatever the provisions in the British North America Act guaranteeing the privileges of the minorities; this is why it is so ardently identified by some as the corner-stone of the constitution. This does no harm since none but limited, though highly vocal, minorities want—or will ever want—they modified; but the procedure puts an equally effective bar to the regrouping and reshifting of the powers of the Dominion and the provinces under sections 91 and 92, a certain amount of which is necessary if this country is not to be handicapped by archaic, outworn conditions. Just a single illustration. A national labor organization recently called loudly for a Dominion measure of unemployment insurance. Such insurance will probably be a necessity of our industrial life in the near future; to be effective it will need to be Dominion-wide in its operation; it cannot come under Dominion control without an amendment to our constitution. Can an amendment vesting the necessary powers in the Dominion be secured under the procedure outlined? Not in a hundred years.

It is absurd to suppose that the Fathers of Confederation intended to give the new Dominion a constitution incapable of modification. That so little was said in the discussions of that day about the means by which the constitution could be amended was due, it is reasonable to assume, to the common

understanding as to the procedure to be followed. That procedure would be the passing by the parliament of Canada of resolutions asking for changes in the constitution. Mr. A. A. Dorion, who led the opposition to Confederation in the Canadian parliament, had a quite clear understanding of how the constitution could be changed. The burden of his speeches in opposition was that the privileges and rights of the French-Canadians would be in danger under confederation; that the guarantees of protection would prove illusory. He foresaw a legislative union in which the minority would be at the mercy of the majority. This would involve a complete change in the constitution. How was it to be brought about? Mr. Dorion explained in detail, (*Confederation Debates*, page 268) :

“Honorable members from Lower Canada are made aware that the delegates all desired a legislative union, but it could not be accomplished at once. This confederation is the first necessary step towards it. The British government is ready to grant a Federal union at once, and when that is accomplished the French element will be completely overwhelmed by the majority of British representatives. What then could prevent the Federal government from passing a set of resolutions in a similar way to those we are called upon to pass, without submitting them to the people, calling upon the Imperial government to set aside the Federal form of government and give a legislative union in place of it?”

If the theory, of which so much has been heard in recent years, that the British North America Act is a treaty between the Federal power and the existing provinces requiring the consent of all before so much as a comma can be changed, had any basis in fact, how complete a rejoinder could have been made to Mr. Dorion's mournful anticipations? He would have been told by the government that a legislative union could not

be brought about because the necessary precedent consent of the provinces could never be obtained. But the reply of the government to this and similar criticisms was vastly different.

Sir E. P. Taché, the Prime Minister, speaking in the Legislative Council, said that the institutions which Lower Canada held so dear would be preserved unimpaired because under Confederation Lower Canada would "preserve its autonomy." This did not satisfy Dorion. There was an interchange of views between him and Cartier dealing with this point which is very illuminating. Dorion said (Confederation Debates, page 690) that no authority had been constituted which could forbid the encroachment upon provincial rights of the Federal parliament. "In case of difference between the Federal power and the local governments, what authority will intervene for its settlement?"

Hon. Atty.-Gen. Cartier: It will be the Imperial Government.

Hon. Mr. Dorion: In effect there will be no other authority than the Imperial Government and we know too well the value assigned to the complaints of Lower Canadians by the Imperial Government.

Hon. Atty.-Gen. Cartier: The delegates understood the matter better than that. Neither the Imperial nor the general government will interfere, but the courts of justice will decide all questions in relation to which there may be differences between the two powers.

There is, it will be seen, a variation in Cartier's two replies; but plainly the second one is the authoritative statement. Cartier proceeded: "Should the general legislature pass a law beyond the limits of its functions, it will be null and void *pleno jure*." Dorion then proceeded to cast doubts upon the impartiality of the Federal courts which were, he understood, to be established "to decide questions of this kind." Cartier said the Federal courts when established would adjudicate solely upon federal laws. At an earlier stage in the discussion

Cartier had declared that "the appeal to the judicial committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council must always exist."

There were explicit engagements by Macdonald and by Cartier that the language rights of the French in the Federal parliament and the language rights of the English in the Quebec legislature would be "secured in the Imperial act." It will thus be seen that it was the view of the government that the rights of the provinces and the language rights of the minorities, secured by law, would be protected by the courts; while Dorion held these guarantees of little value, since the Federal parliament, in which the French element would be in a minority, could "call" upon the Imperial parliament to change the constitution itself. It was Dorion's insistence that the rights of the minority could thus be destroyed by the Federal parliament that was in large part responsible for the emphasis put by Cartier and his colleagues upon the claim that the minority would be able thoroughly to defend its rights in the Dominion parliament itself. This note is sounded again and again in the discussion. The bulwarks of defence were the composition of the Senate and the French representation in the House of Commons and in the executive government. Some citations may be in order. Sir Narcisse Belleau, who succeeded Sir Etienne Taché as Prime Minister, dwelt upon the power of the French members to protect minority rights by destroying the government that threatened them. "The influence of Lower Canada," said Sir Narcisse (*Confederation Debates*, page 185) "will enable her to make and unmake governments when her interests shall be at stake or threatened. And if the importance of this responsibility of the Federal governments were well understood there would be no anxiety about our institutions." "Supposing," said Hector Langevin, the Solicitor-General, (*Confederation Debates*, page 368), "that an unjust measure was passed in the House of Commons, it would be stopped in the legislative council for there we shall

be represented equally with the other sections and that is a guarantee that our interests will be amply protected."

The rôle of the Senate as the protector of the smaller provinces and of the minorities was stressed by George Brown; to perform this service it was necessary that its membership should be limited to fixed numbers. "It is perfectly clear," said Mr. Brown, "as was contended by those who represented Lower Canada in the Conference, that if the number of Legislative Councillors was made capable of increase you would thereby sweep away the whole protection they had from the Upper Chamber." When Mr. Dunkin urged that it was not proper that the number of Senators should be limited, Cartier interposed with the comment: "That is our security." Dorion raised the debating point that the Federal government, owing to the predominance of non-French elements, might not appoint to the Upper House senators who could be relied upon to protect the interests of Lower Canada and the minority. Cartier brushed the objection aside impatiently (*Confederation Debates*, page 571): "Am I not in a minority at present in appointing judges? And yet when I propose the appointment of a judge for Lower Canada is he not appointed? . . . When the leader for Lower Canada shall have sixty-five members belonging to his section to support him and command a majority of the French-Canadians and of the British from Lower Canada will he not be able to upset the government if his colleagues interfere with his recommendations to office? That is our security."

The study of the best available transcript of the minds of the public men of Canada at the time the constitution of Canada was in the making thus shows quite clearly that those who were engaged in this task believed that the rights of the minority and of the provinces would be protected by the courts under the constitution; and by the strength of the minority's representation in the Federal government and in

the Senate if these rights were threatened by proposed action by the Federal parliament—action which, it is to be borne in mind, could not be effective unless it resulted in some modification of the constitution. There is not a word about the provinces being charged with the responsibility and the power of defending the constitutional rights of the minorities. They do not come into the picture at all.

The record shows that the procedure which Mr. Dorion had in his mind has been followed, with a single variation for which there was a special reason, since Confederation by the successive Dominion governments of differing political affiliations. Repeatedly, by legislation within the powers of the Federal parliament or by legislation by the British parliament following a joint address by both Houses of Parliament, it has effected changes in or additions to the arrangement between the Dominion and the provinces as fixed by the British North America Act in the face of protestations from the opposition of the day that consultation with the provinces and the obtaining of their consent was obligatory in keeping with the "treaty" of 1867. In 1869 the Dominion parliament increased the subsidies to Nova Scotia against the protest of the Liberal opposition that this course was unconstitutional. Edward Blake argued that the Dominion parliament had no right to alter or modify in any way the Union act. Hon. E. B. Wood, who moved an amendment, held that the financial arrangements of the act were a matter of treaty. "The union," according to Hon. Luther Holton, "was held to be a compact or treaty between the provinces, merely homologated by the supreme power." Here we have in essence the claim that the provinces' consent is necessary to any variation of the British North America Act. The government's proposal was ratified both in the Commons and the Senate by substantial majorities. Two years later when the Dominion government gave British Columbia, upon entering Confederation, representation in

both the Commons and the Senate absurdly out of proportion to its population its action was challenged as a flagrant breach of the constitution since it weakened proportionately the representation of the other provinces. The Liberal objections were set out in an amendment declaring that this provision in the British Columbia bill was "in violation of the fundamental principle of the constitution, a principle which ought not to be disturbed without the consent of the provinces." The amendment was rejected. It is to be noted that in the previous year the granting of undue representation to Manitoba upon its admission to the union had been opposed by David Mills. Mr. Mills put on the order paper in the session of 1871 a motion, in anticipation of the submission to the British parliament of the measure in ratification of the Manitoba Act, declaring that any alteration by Imperial legislation of the principle of representation laid down in the British North America Act without the consent of the several parties that were parties to the compact would be a violation of the federal principle in the constitution. This resolution was not debated nor was it pressed to a vote, from which it is reasonable to infer that it commanded no considerable measure of support.

Considerable light is thrown upon the ideas current at that time with respect to the procedure to be followed in securing constitutional legislation by the discussion in the Canadian parliament which preceded the passage of the British North America Act, confirming the Manitoba Act of 1870 by the Imperial Parliament in 1871. If it was the understanding at the time of Confederation that the provinces were to be parties, at least to the point of giving their consent, to constitutional legislation, it is a little remarkable that no province took exception to the admission to the family of Manitoba under special conditions as to representation, nor to the extensive powers conferred upon the Dominion by the British North America Act of 1871 for the establishment of new provinces.

It is worth noting that in the Senate in 1914 Senator Dandurand held that before this Imperial legislation was sought the older provinces should have been consulted. It was the original purpose of the Canadian government to have this legislation enacted by the Imperial parliament on the authority of a request by them; and the passage, finally, of an address by both houses was due to the insistence of the Opposition. Edward Blake moved a resolution declaring that "the sense of both Houses of Parliament should be taken as to and should form the basis of such proposed legislation." "The question," said Mr. Blake in a supporting speech, "was whether the people were prepared to surrender into the hands of the government of the day that power which the government of the day was assuming it possessed—the power to ask the Imperial parliament to make laws for us; or whether the House did not think that every sense of duty called upon them to determine that their sense—that was, the sense of the people—was to be taken upon and was to form the basis of that Imperial legislation." It may be urged that this was a special case in which the provinces had no interest; and that this accounted for the fact that they were not consulted. To those who think so the following extracts from the contribution to the debate made by A. T. Galt, one of the Fathers of Confederation, may be of interest:

"He (Galt) thought the greatest care should be exercised in dealing with the British North America Act. Under the old province of Canada the act of union had never been changed except on address of the Legislative and it was most important that some rule should be followed in dealing with the British North America Act. . . .

"He was not prepared to allow the government to exercise a power which should alone be exercised by parliament; and he hoped the government would see the propriety of proceeding by way of address. *The*

matter was one of great importance for the only security the provinces had was that their constitutional rights could not be changed by any government that might be in power, but by Parliament only. He thought the government before taking the vote should consider whether it would not be better to decide that for all time to come no change should be made in the British North America Act except in the usual approved method of address to the Queen."

Let us now consider the case of the British North America Act of 1915 passed by the Imperial Parliament following a joint address by the two Houses of the Canadian parliament. This act added to the number of senators, thus diminishing the power of the original provinces in the upper house; and it permanently suspended the operation of the principle set out in the B.N.A. Act of 1867 for the determination of the relative representation of the various provinces in the House of Commons in cases where the population of provinces falls below certain minimum levels. This was clearly a case where the rights of the older provinces were affected. But the provinces were not consulted. Nor did they make any representations either to the Dominion parliament or the Imperial parliament, which is somewhat remarkable inasmuch as the theory that parliament could not act without the consent of the provinces was set out explicitly while the address was being considered in parliament in the session of 1914. "I have a grave doubt," said Mr. Bostock, the Liberal leader in the Senate, "if we have a right to ask the British parliament to make such a change in the agreement which brought about Confederation." He doubted very much whether the Imperial parliament would consider themselves justified in "breaking the compact which forms the basis of Confederation on a mere address from the members of the two houses of the Canadian parliament." "All the provinces should be consulted before such a modification is made in the Federal act," declared

Senator David. Senator Dandurand, accepting the myth that the Fathers of Confederation had recognized that there were certain matters that could not be touched by parliament without a reference to the provinces, said:

“I contend that the four provinces that entered into that contract in 1864 should be officially consulted. If we go over their heads, direct to the Imperial Parliament, for an amendment to the British North America Act on this point we will have established a precedent which will justify the legislators of the future going direct from this parliament to the Imperial parliament without consulting those provinces on the most important and vital questions. . . . I believe that if the provinces were approached within the next few months they would gladly agree to this proposal.”

Senator Beique was also certain that the address was a clear violation of the “compact.” He moved an amendment that the provision providing a minimum representation for provinces under certain conditions should not take effect “until the consent of the legislatures of the several provinces has been obtained.” The amendment was lost on division with no recorded vote.

The record, it is submitted, does not give support to the theory that the provinces have a recognized right to be consulted when amendments to the constitution are proposed and to withhold their consent at will. This is a myth. Of course, it is not asserted that the Federal parliament held that action by the British parliament automatically followed the passage of a joint address by the Canadian parliament, though the statement of A. T. Galt, quoted above, might be interpreted as supporting such a claim; the plenary powers of the Imperial parliament in these matters were presumably recognized, at least in the earlier years of Confederation. This would give opportunity to a province, a corporate interest or, for that matter, a private individual to protest against the passage by

the Imperial parliament of a bill to which objections could be urged. But this is far different from the claim, now put forth on behalf of the provinces, that they have a prescriptive right to destroy a measure to amend the constitution by withholding their consent. They have no such right.

The adjustment of the provincial subsidies in 1907 by an amendment to the British North America Act following a conference between the provinces and the Dominion is commonly cited as formally establishing the over-riding authority (for that is what the claim amounts to) of the provinces. There is a remarkable amount of misunderstanding current about the legislation of 1907. In following this procedure the parliament of Canada, says Sir George Ross in *The Senate of Canada*, "recognized for the first time that the Union act was a treaty, to be amended only with the consent of the parties that were bound by it." He quotes no authority for this statement and a perusal of the debate fails to bring to light the slightest authority for it. Senator Dandurand, pleading in 1914 for consultation with the provinces before the parliament of Canada requested a change in the British North America Act, cited the precedent of 1907. He claimed that the address to the British parliament on that occasion stated that the desired amendment had the consent and sanction of the various provinces. There is no such statement in the address. There is nothing in the address to suggest that the provinces had anything whatever to do with the requested amendment to the act. When the Dominion government decided to put subsidies to the provinces on a new basis for the quieting of grievances of various kinds, it naturally discussed the question with them, since not to satisfy them would have meant a continuance of the agitation to which the government wished to put an end. If the proceedings had been intended to signify submission to the view that the consent of all the provinces must be obtained, they would have ended in dead-

lock since both British Columbia and Prince Edward Island by formal resolution of the Legislatures refused to accept the settlement. Mr. A. A. McLean, a member of parliament from Prince Edward Island, expressed the opinion that in the face of these protests the Dominion should not proceed. "This parliament," he said, "ought not to pass a resolution when any province protests against it. Will the Imperial Parliament, in the face of the protests of British Columbia and Prince Edward Island, pass this legislation?" The Dominion government, undeterred, forwarded the address to the British government. Premier McBride of British Columbia journeyed to London to oppose the passage of the bill in the form in which it was drafted by the Dominion government. The bill went through with the deletion of a phrase, which was in any case meaningless. Mr. Churchill, who piloted the bill through the British House of Commons, gave two explanations of the reason for this deletion. This is one explanation:

"The prime minister of British Columbia thought that the words 'final and unalterable' should not be inserted in the bill. It is true that these words were in the address of the Dominion parliament but they were unusual and unsuitable in an act of parliament."

The words were, of course, mere surplusage, an idle political flourish, as both Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding admitted in the debate in the House of Commons. Their presence in the address was fortunate since they enabled Mr. Churchill to save Mr. McBride's face. In his statement to the Commons, Mr. Churchill said further:

"He did not pretend to go into the merits of the difference on a constitutional question between British Columbia and the Federal government. We on this side did not know enough to decide upon the merits of the claim. On the other hand he would be very sorry if it were thought that the action which His Majesty's

government had decided to take meant that they had decided to establish as a precedent that whenever there was a difference on a constitutional question between the Federal government and one of the provinces the Imperial government would always be prepared to accept the Federal point of view as against the provincial. In deference to the representations of British Columbia the words 'final and unalterable' applying to the revised scale had been omitted from the bill."

If the provinces as blockers of constitutional change have a charter it is to be found in these words of Mr. Churchill. They do not, however, amount to much. The British parliament carried out the request of the Dominion parliament and indicated a decided disinclination to arbitrate between the Dominion and a province on the sound ground that it was not sufficiently informed to enable it to make a finding. This attitude of disinclination to question the advisability of falling in with the desires of the Dominion parliament would probably be a good deal more pronounced hereafter than in 1907 if this issue should again arise.

A state of deadlock, certain to have the most serious consequences both to the unity and the prosperity of Canada, can only be averted by the Dominion Parliament rejecting the spirit of abdication which has been so much in evidence among its leaders, and taking up again its duty to give this country the necessary lead when circumstances call for a forward step. Fortunately, the Dominion parliament is not formally committed to the heresy that it is powerless to do anything in the way of securing essential changes in the British North America Act until nine provincial legislatures have condescended to give their approval. Perhaps the threat to the proper procedure has been more apparent than real. If the Privy Council had not by a political decision given Canadian women the right to sit in the Senate, the Dominion government would have had to seek an amendment to the British

North America Act. It is difficult to imagine the government, under these circumstances, asking the consent of nine provinces before proceeding with the routine of submitting an address to the Houses of Parliament. If any Dominion government ever seriously proposes to follow the Ross formula, as outlined above, there will be immediate need for a rally of public opinion against so abject a betrayal of the rights of parliament.

In the discussion in the House of Commons in 1925 of the resolution submitted by the late W. F. Maclean, favouring the right of the Dominion Parliament to amend the constitution, subject to certain safeguards for the minority, Mr. MacKenzie King made a speech of much significance. Mr. King said (Hansard, 1925, page 333):

“So far as the letter of the law is concerned, the Canadian people, technically speaking, have not the right or power to amend the constitution without asking the British parliament to pass a law for that purpose and without the consent of the British parliament. If that were taken to imply that the British parliament itself might, whenever it wished to do so, amend our constitution without any reference to Canada, or that the British parliament, when it was requested so to do might with respect to an amendment refuse to carry out the wishes of the Canadian people, then we might say that we had not the right to amend our own constitution; that some other body, namely, the British parliament possessed that right. But where the facts are as we know them to be that this parliament approaching the British parliament in a constitutional and regular way, by an address of both Houses requesting any amendment to our constitution, will have the amendment carried out in accordance with its wishes, it cannot be said that we have not the right or the power to amend our constitution. We have both. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the conventions of the constitution are just as important and binding as the law in a matter of this kind, and that the convention governing the

amendment of the Canadian constitution to-day is that whenever the people of Canada proceed in a constitutional way to ask the British parliament as their agent—because it is practically as their agent that they ask the British parliament to do this—to amend the constitution in a particular way, the British parliament will always proceed so as to act in accordance with that request. That being the case, this country has the full constitutional right to amend its constitution.”

Mr. King's remarks do not necessarily preclude his acceptance of the view that before the Canadian Parliament makes its request upon the Imperial parliament it must seek the approval of the provinces to be sure that “the people of Canada” approve; but his careful avoidance of any reference to the provinces rather suggests that he holds the opinion that the parliament of Canada is, in this respect, in itself fully representative of the people.

Whether, if this procedure be followed, the action of the British parliament will be as automatic as Mr. King suggests may be doubted. Nothing, of course, could prevent Canadian provinces or Canadian interests from objecting to amendments to the Canadian constitution being made. What the British parliament would do, under these conditions, is a subject for speculation. But whatever it did—whether it sat in judgment or accepted without question the recommendation of the Canadian parliament—there would be a dangerous and unfortunate reaction in Canada. One such experience would be sufficient to convince the Canadian public that London is not the place where amendments to the Canadian constitution should be made.

There ought to be set up in Canada simple and easily workable machinery by which changes could be made in our constitution as the need for them arises. The United States system or the Australian system could be readily adapted to Canadian conditions. The opposition to this comes from those

who hold extreme views as to the blocking powers of the provinces. While they remain in this mood the right of the Dominion parliament—in conformity with the apparent intention of the framers of our constitution, with the established procedure and with the plain dictates of reason—to advise the British parliament as to constitutional amendments ought to be unflinchingly asserted. The alternative is deadlock.

THE SEA IN FICTION

BY MORLEY ROBERTS

AS the actual ship is a narrow scene and the sea often monotonous, their value in imaginative narrative depends entirely on treatment. Much of this fiction is not very good from a seaman's point of view. All fiction has its conventions, but these must be consonant with some degree of truth, so that, granting them, the rest follows naturally, all "ship-shape and Bristol fashion," as the old sea-dogs used to say. But the conventions of bad fiction tend all the time to get away from what we call 'truth.' And 'truth' here and in all fiction may be defined as that which does not outrage the feelings and contradict the knowledge and experience of those acquainted with the subject. One might dilate on bad sea fiction if it were not that special knowledge is needed to rage at or be delighted with the amazing errors and howlers of those who write without knowing their subject. In respect of its 'mystery' and its language and conditions the real old sea-dog is as terrible a conservative as any die-hard, and cannot be amused by ignorant idiocies. This strong characteristic of those who follow the sea is especially seen when anything is written which conflicts with the traditional relations of the men or officers with their superiors, and it is roused even more strongly when the sea is regarded as something very romantic.

It may be taken for granted that nearly all modern work about the sea, especially that seen in magazines, is essentially bad in the sense that it is false. However well written and however popular it may be, a seaman will turn it down. I do not propose to criticize living writers, and shall therefore conceal the name of one whose "popular sea-book," as the critics call it, was condemned as utterly silly by a well-known

merchant captain and his officers, and, after having had that judgment written on its fly-leaf in the strongest maritime diction, was put into a tin box and solemnly consigned to the sea in Turk's Island Passage. Lately I picked up a novel, largely about sea-life, by a clever writer, and, having opened it at a passage which showed a reasonable amount of knowledge, I turned to another in which all my feelings were so outraged that I became speechless. The indefatigable novelist had evidently read up his subject! Is there anything more fatal? The result at its best is mechanical and lifeless. No one but the seaman can say how easy it is to fall into errors. Even he himself, when far from those dear old ships which now are so rarely seen and to-morrow will not be seen at all, can make real technical mistakes. Let me confess with great shame that in a story I once stowed the mizzen topmast-staysail in the main-top when I should have stowed it in its proper net. I gasped when I read it in print. Of course, I meant to write the mizzen t'gallant staysail! Such mistakes are easy when writing hurriedly, though they are not fatal if the atmosphere is right. The uneducated, unsalted sea-writer always gets that wrong. It is true that there is an old sea yarn of a Greek who said "different ship, different fash," when he went aft to stow the jib, but a ship is still a ship, and the seaman so loves her that any ignorance displayed by those who pretend to know her excites his loftiest indignation.

Because I have had some little personal acquaintance with ships, especially with the foc'sle of ships and the many ways of the sea and seamen of all classes—British, Dutchmen, Dagoes and even Lascars—I am often asked to 'look over' and 'put right' books written by those who want to delineate some part of a sailor's life. In every case the mistakes might with much labour be corrected, were it not that in all of them the whole psychological background is somehow fundamentally false. Put them right indeed! How can one render righteous that

which is shaped in iniquity of ignorance? Once a well-known novelist, not assuredly of the first or second rank, asked me to 'look over and put right' the first three chapters of a new book. I reported that they were utterly wrong and must be altered. "Why, I should have to rewrite them," he said indignantly. "Exactly so," I replied. "Well, I shan't. The public will never know." And they were printed as they stood. In other cases I have done my best and failed utterly. But the writers could not believe that a seaman would turn their books down about five minutes after they took him to sea.

Is then technique so important? I think the answer is 'yes and no.' A genius can write what he likes. Oliver Madox Brown's *Black Swan* is in its way great. I do not care if the ship 'rocked' rather than rolled. Nor do I suffer when I find that folks can run about in the 'tween decks and the hold when she goes to sea. But we are not all geniuses, and the less we are of that order the more careful we must be. Are then ignorant seamen judges of literature? No, but they are competent judges of the competence of the writers to write about the sea.

It is a very old subject, the sea. Some may recall the part that the Mediterranean played in the history of romance, of romantic writing. Pirates came and took away the fair damsel. Even these pirates of romance seem to have behaved romantically, for she usually survived to be rescued by her lover. One may say rightly that sea fiction began with the *Odyssey*. Are not all the adventures proper to romance in that gorgeous sea-story? Then, long, long afterwards, followed the post-classical romances, such as *Ephesiaca*, or *the Loves of Anthea and Abrocomas*. Here we have pirates and the sea and love, sometimes, as nowadays, unduly prominent. Still we may say that the whole of modern fiction flowed from the *Odyssey*, that high spring upon Olympus. Yes, even Balzac and those who write psycho-analytical novels, as well

as those who pen good and true sea-tales, may touch their forelocks to our mythical Homer and his sea-captain Odysseus.

With such an ancestry may we not get mingled results? There are some great names in the written romance of the sea. The Greeks are still fine seamen, though liable to panic in great emergencies, but they have not adorned sea literature since the days of the romances I have mentioned. In France there has been one sea-writer—Loti. As a writer about the sea or the sea-mind I cannot rate Loti very highly. There is a morbidity and unwholesomeness about him which I often find unpleasant. He writes about himself rather than the sea. I am told he was a good and keen seaman, and find it hard to believe. The salt-laden breezes of a sea life ought to have blown out of him his unpleasant subjectivity. Victor Hugo at sea is out of his element and would be if one did not recognize that he is merely acting somewhat flamboyantly in a theatre with a painted backcloth of ocean. It is in the English tongue that the greatest sea-stories have been written. And how curious it is that one of the best-known of all should be by an Anglicized Pole, Joseph Conrad.

Mr. George Moore has lately told us, by a pleasant implication, that he is the only real writer left to the English world. This he did, beautifully in indirectness, by saying that the late Thomas Hardy was not a writer of any importance whatever and that Conrad was nowhere. Hardy, who knew not the sea but found an almost equal grandeur in a silent and sombre moorland, can even when dead take care of himself, and in *The Dynasts*, *The Woodlanders*, and some of his poems, has a great and enduring defence. This is beside the main question, but to deal with Conrad is here part of my task, and if I say in what he failed, or in what personally I think he failed, it must not be assumed that I regard him in his best work and highest moments as anything but a great writer.

It is the business of a seaman and the result of his training to be ready for all emergencies—wind or fog or fire or wreck—and with that alertness of mind which is his very foundation he must be skilful in ready adaptation so that he can use any tool that comes to his hand, whether it was meant for the task or not. But in languages we cannot say that the seaman is so wonderful. He can, of course, as a rule, swear very effectually in many, though somewhat crudely, and not with the magnificence that seems proper to the sea. Conrad was not English and yet he took English as a tool and mastered it, or so nearly mastered it that the flaws in the web he wove are strangely few. If some of his best work is not remembered when Mr. Moore's alembicated and sophisticated efforts to be remarkable through the ages are wholly forgotten, then I am greatly mistaken.

What is it we seek in stories, in stories of the sea? We seek to know the lives and ways of men and living things or those elusive elements to which we deny a life. We want to find out what the lives of seamen are. We have an inborn curiosity about our native sea. We want to know the secrets and springs and purposes of the heart of the seaman. What, then, is his heart? Conrad tells us much, and sometimes too much for him to be English. And as we try to learn the truth we find seamen very silent, for the Englishman and the Scotchman are always just a little loath to let anyone see what they feel about themselves, and, even if they do love the sea and feel its magic, cannot bear to own that they do. In many things Conrad can help us in that, just because he was an alien.

Here I must explain why it is that by and large, as seamen say, he does not appeal to them so much as he does to landsmen. Often I read him with a curious uneasiness which I have found in others, and this in spite of the truth with which he depicts man and the elements. There are stories by which I am not disturbed. Take for a moment his *Typhoon*,—a gale

at sea, a real gale, not one of those about which lady passengers love to tell us, not one of those which a complaisant captain with his tongue in his cheek says is the worst he has ever known, but a real gale, a "whole" gale, and more. For a typhoon, a cyclone, or a hurricane is one of the greatest and most terrible of natural phenomena. Many have felt the wind and have heard it cry aloud and shake the house, but not many have known the best and worst it can do. Conrad knew and depicted it in that tale of the stubborn old sea-captain, who, ignorant of the nature of a cyclone, held on to its centre and then again emerged into the hell that circles around the vortex of that great whirlwind. I have myself been under some such domination in an old sailing ship, and have known what it was to feel that the end might come at any moment. The blind fury of the elements that deafens men and blows their very words out of their mouths is drawn wonderfully by Conrad. None can know all until he has himself felt the wind as something alive and dreadful that would, so it seemed, tear one from the deck and send a living body to leeward like a wisp of dry spun yarn. Even on the land in a tornado I have lain for three hours holding on to the root of a bent and broken little tree, and have wondered how long I should be left to lie there. If I could write of that as Conrad wrote of a cyclone I might hope for some remembrance.

Yet if Conrad can do this, why do I often read him with uneasiness? It is difficult to explain to any but seamen. To some of them, who scarcely understood why they did not wholly like him, my theory has commended itself. The truth is that Conrad, good seaman as he was, could never by his nature be an Englishman. He was to the last day of his life a Central European. For no man can get away from his ancestors, and Conrad's were those who had no recent salt in their bones. How does the Englishman look upon the sea? He knows instinctively and without knowing it that the race

of man sprang out of it. He has had no long centuries apart from it. He cries for it in his youth. He even goes down to Brighton at the end of the week as if he were going home. My old friend, W. H. Hudson, whenever he got to the sea, scooped up and drank a handful of salt water. I know an artist who, when slightly exhilarated by alcohol, walked into it, clothes and all, as soon as he came to it. "Why do you do that?" asked one of his amazed friends. "You are a fool and don't understand," said the painter as he sat down in the water. The sea to a seaman is the place where he gets his living. The ship in the old days was his house. Sometimes he adorned his poor narrow bunk with photographs and pictures that he might be all the more at home when at sea. "Romance of the sea," said an old mate to me once, "is all bosh. I get my living by it, and it's as romantic as driving a bus up and down White-chapel Road." That is an extremely arid view, no doubt, but it shows something of the seaman's mind. That old mate could admire things as much as anyone, but he would rather have been drowned than admit it. His description of a cyclone would be what he must put in the log-book. He would compress all hell into three lines and end, perhaps, with "John Smith and Thomas Robinson washed overboard."

Does not this explain such a man's attitude to Conrad? Conrad is always surprised by the sea; it is always wonderful and 'austere.' A fine word, 'austere,' but it takes austerity to find it in the ocean. Our seamen are most decidedly not austere, and take the sea as it comes; it is their job to beat it or be drowned, and up to that point to make a jest of it. Conrad gives himself away too much. He is always self-conscious. He is never at home at sea. For him the sea *is* something "to make a song about," to "write home about." The average seaman never makes a song about a 'breeze,' and at sea a breeze means that moderate gale which is described by passengers as 'a dreadful storm.' This attitude is not

mere stupidity or insensitiveness; it is dictated by humour and knowledge, knowledge inborn as well as acquired, and however much Conrad learned and observed, he had neither humour nor any inborn salt in him. Nevertheless, he remains a great writer of the sea. Absence of humour is not fatal to a writer. If it were—what of Milton? And as I am, as it were, damning false romance and over-sensitiveness, let me go back a little in the centuries to very grim realities.

Tobias Smollett must have a word or two, for though he never wrote anything but scraps and chapters about the sea, he has the naval atmosphere of his time in all its brutality. A Scotchman and a surgeon of his savage and contentious character was hardly likely to view things naval in a roseate light, but we recognize in every word the character of truth, in every seeming caricature a portrait. What ships and men were in Smollett's time may be inferred from far later documents. The log of Nelson's *Victory* just before Trafalgar contains repeated instances of men being flogged in batches for drunkenness. Smollett was a man of letters by nature, that is, he had the seeing eye and the urge to put down what he saw. A realist or naturalist, we may call him. He said what he saw "without mitigation or remorse of voice." But coarse as it often was, he had humour, and also that which is full brother to pathos, as one can see in his picture—a very living and dying picture it is—of Commodore Trunnion "taking his last departure." Those days have gone; the old pig-tailed seaman is no more. The state of affairs I knew fifty years ago in undermanned, underfed merchant ships must have been paradise compared with life aboard the King's ships in Smollett's time. Nothing but the inextinguishable humour of our men could have made life possible. There is no romance, then, in Smollett. Yet if it is grim enough and foul enough and coarse enough we may be thankful that over all is the glimmer of humour, and at rare times, the dew of pity. How shall

we get romance in such conditions except by falsehood, by suppression of the truth and the suggestion of the lie?

Even in the seventies there could be little romance for seamen, save for some youth fresh to salt water and full of the inextinguishable love of experience and adventure. We lived for'ard in the foc'sle, a dim and dark den often with no light, for when the weather was bad the scuttle just above our heads was closed. We had bunks ranged one over another on port and starboard sides, narrow enough coffins with a "donkey's breakfast," otherwise a bed of rough ticking and straw, for us to sleep on. To sleep when we could! In the hot weather, bugs; in the cold weather, cold; in the rough and wet weather, ceaseless and unconquerable damp. There was no door to the foc'sle I am thinking of; nothing but a canvas screen that waved and flapped in the wind. When she dived and shipped a sea a cascade came in over the bows and poured down on the deck. As she dived again the sea inboard rushed for'ard as we skipped up on chests to avoid it. Maybe we did not avoid it. The two hawse pipes, up in the "eyes of her" for the cables, were plugged ineffectually. As she hit a sea, water squirted in on us with the force of a hydraulic jet. Once and more than once my mates and I have been wet through for a fortnight. There was no drying of clothes. My own mate and I wrung out ours as we stripped when going "below," and took the warm wet things to bed with us into wet cold blankets so that they should at least be warm when we turned out. When we did so each bunk steamed, for we had been sleeping in a cold wet pack that we had made a hot one. In very heavy weather, or when it was coming on, we had little chance to sleep. No sooner were we hard at it than we heard the shrill pipe of the bo'sun and the inevitable call of "all hands". In the old days before that time they seem at least to have had enough "beef to the braces" to handle a ship even with one of the watches. But in the seventies it was all hands when-

ever a topsail had to be reefed or picked up. I can remember spending ten hours aloft out of three four-hour watches, two of which it should have been my turn to stay below. And the food? Hardest beef, beef or horse, *quien sabe?* and hard tack full of maggots, and reasty pork and—the gracious gift of the then Board of Trade—those awful things known as preserved potatoes, and tea or tea-dock sweepings, in a bucket and our own tin plates and pannikins; and, once in a blue moon, if the skipper and the steward were alike gracious, the salt scraping of an emptied butter-cask. Of course, it was not always like that, for long months of it, as we used to say, would have killed a brass monkey. We had our decent times, if the officers were decent men. In fine weather, in the trades, when we touched neither sheet nor tack for weeks together and there was shade here and there to work in, life was pleasant if it was an English ship. In American ships there was rarely any good time. The one thing they did well was to feed the men. But, by all the gods of the sea, they took out of them more than they put in!

It is true that nowadays, save in disaster, things at sea are rarely so peculiarly lacking in comfort. For now men will not stand so much, and wise shipowners will not try them, while the best of shipowners would not if they could. Whatever is done for the seaman, when true tales are told of him so that his life is known, nothing can do away with tragedy at sea—tragedy sudden and terrible, or most awfully prolonged. The passing of the noble square-rigged ship in her majesty cannot do away with disaster, and if the old comedies seem doomed to sink with her, other tales must remain to be told, even if they are not so naturally linked with the immemorial past, out of which the sailing-ship emerged by a true path of evolution.

Yet what about romance with such conditions? Do we not want both humour and forgetfulness, even to spell the

word? In one book at least I have taken a partly romantic view of sea life. But in that I used youth—a youth long since departed, or shall I even say, dead? Perhaps, like all of us, I overrate my own humour. Had I had as much humour as the best known and most popular and most loved writer of the sea, I might have reconciled myself more easily to tales I cannot read. Marryat is the very king of the humour of the old navy: the great classic of sea-humour is *Midshipman Easy*. It is true that here and there I come across someone, usually a serious-minded woman, who cannot get on with it. And yet, though there is some knockabout fun, it is never coarse. There is none of Smollett's rude and brutal realism, but a realism such as springs from a joyous but also really observant and thoughtful temperament. Besides mere jests, we find in Marryat much wisdom, knowledge of men as well as knowledge of the weather and the ways of the sea, and he can also make us sorrowful. Are there now boys who have not read Marryat? How many did he send to the sea? Many of those found that in fiction we are apt to compress adventure and the episodes which lighten the seaman's daily toil. But the sea took hold of them and made most of them its own. There are books which I read, or at least look at lovingly once or twice a year. Among these, not the least loved is *Midshipman Easy*.

Our marvellous old Hakluyt's collection is the great sea book of all time and all the world. But is there indeed a great sea-novel or story, anything which surpasses a mere tale, or even the true and sombre picture of Smollett, or the gaily-coloured truth of Marryat? Yes, I think there is. It is now many years ago, well over forty years, since W. H. Hudson and I discovered *Moby-Dick* for ourselves, I know not how. I have lived to see it become a classic of a tentative kind, as it can be found now in the great *Everyman* series, and purchased for a song. What one finds there is something very marvellous indeed. Sometimes we hear of Americans asking when the great American book is to come before the world. They own

Hawthorne and his *Scarlet Letter*, Poe and his strange tales which the world knows of, and Walt Whitman, that even now only a few really value at his worth. But where is the great book? They do not know that it was written long ago when Herman Melville gave them the story of the great white whale.

This is a book of a kind for which we have no name. I am told that some reject with scorn great wines that come from such far-off places as Australia because they cannot truly be classed with wines of the Medoc or of Burgundy. This book is a novel, and more. It is a romance, and more, for it stands alone. It is a book of the whale, and more, for it is a book of man: a book of the sea and a book of the world. In English literature we have at least one book which, by its peculiar and almost monstrous and overwhelming character, has no class, no true peer. I mean *Wuthering Heights*. In that strange work of a sick and wonderful woman, the wind sobs in the hills and crags and is mingled with the cries and passions of men and women. A strange chorus, and one that sounds again in our ears whenever we remember Emily Brontë. There is no such picture of the common, though magnificently heightened, passions of man in *Moby-Dick*, and yet in it we find an equal and more restrained power. As I think of the characters—true, though strange; intelligible, though gigantic—I wonder whether it is, or should be thought, a book of the sea at all. For the oceans are its background, and the ship is, as it were, a world apart, and it may be that the demoniac and dreadful white spermaceti whale is the fate we pursue and would overcome, the fate that in the end consumes and destroys us. Whatever kind of book we think it, or whether we think of it as a great thing standing for ever without likeness or a peer, it is at least the work of a seaman, a man before the mast, a man who went whaling, who knew the sea and its work and his own work, and was, in this book at least, a great genius.

My readers may know the story of the mad, or maddened Nantucket sea-captain and whaler who chased about the round world the great white spermaceti whale, which at an earlier period had torn off his leg. A queer, strange thesis on which to build a very pyramid of a book. Captain Ahab is perhaps almost monstrous, and yet we believe in him. We sympathize with him and with the harried and tormented and enraged whale himself. Himself I say, not itself, for this whale is more than a mere whale. He is a power, a force, an intelligence, and in the end looses the knot of the tragedy by destruction and victory. But who can tell the story? The characters tell it: the writer himself, a dim foc'sle figure; the Captain, Starbuck and Stubbs, the mates, Queequeg, the Indian harpooner. And there is the little boy, the cabin-boy, who soliloquizes so strangely and yet so credibly that we wonder. But is not the essence of great writing the power of making us believe, we know not why? We get faith, and there's an end on't.

Whaling was once the great sport; now it is sheer murder, for it is done with bombs, not mere harpoons, while pumps inflate the dead whale lest he sink after death. In Melville's time it was a fearful sport—cruel, dreadful and magnificent. He gives us pictures of the whale in all his ways. He peers into the depths, and sees the mother whale with her infant just born; or sees it suckle, and he is often sorry. His picture of the gigantic, partly maimed and often wounded Moby-Dick, with his savagery and swift intelligence and awful wrath, is something without its equal in sea literature. Read, and consider whether with all its faults the book does not stand out as a real masterpiece. Faults it has. Melville gave way too much to his lyrical spirit, and often confounded poetry with pure prose, so that he wrote neither, but terrible hybrid stuff that some ill-educated folks think poetic prose. And yet he could write prose of a high rhetorical order, or of the greatest

simplicity, and he saw deep into the hearts of men. I shall quote but one short passage to show how he could command and order words, so that they fell, as fragments of shining glass fall in a kaleidoscope, into wonderful patterns. This passage follows one which describes the certain terrors—of which Melville was a master—which came upon Starbuck, the mate. In the beginning of this passage he depicts man as he sometimes seems to be, and indeed sometimes is, as grand and clad in an august dignity. And then he cries out:

If, then, to meanest mariners and renegades and castaways, I shall hereafter ascribe high qualities, though dark: weave around them tragic graces: if even the most mournful, perchance the most abased, among them all, shall at times lift himself to the exalted mounts: if I shall endow that workman's arm with some ethereal light: if I shall spread a rainbow over his disastrous set of sun: then against all mortal critics bear me out in it, thou just Spirit of Equality, which hast spread one royal mantle of humanity over all my kind! Bear me out in it, thou great democratic God! who didst not refuse to the swart convict, Bunyan, the pale poetic pearl: Thou, who didst clothe with doubly hammered leaves of finest gold, the stumped and paupered arm of old Cervantes; Thou who didst pick up Andrew Jackson from the pebbles; who didst hurl him upon a warhorse; who didst thunder him higher than a throne! Thou who in all thy mighty earthly marchings, ever cullest Thy selected champions from the kindly commons: bear me out in it, O God!

It is the work and delight of writers to use and order words. However curious in over-wrought rhetoric this passage may seem, none can deny it peculiar power and the strangeness of some new beauty. It has often been said that there is something strange and disturbing in all beauty that we see for the first time. But here was the one time cabin-boy, the poor foremast hand in a whaler, the captive of wild South Sea Islanders, become the king and commander of great words. Yet as in all literature there is descent, a pedigree—as nothing springs full-armed from nothingness—it is a matter of real

literary interest to discover that this passage owes its origin to the last writer in the world we might think Melville would have cared to read. For it must have been suggested by Laurence Sterne, of all men.

There are other writers, who were at least honest men and did their work as well as might be. I have no sea-praise or sea-salt to award Clark Russell. His work is not really 'true'. His sea psychology is almost always wrong. Whenever you find in any sea story one of the officers familiar with any of the crew, or openly sympathetic with any of their grievances, you may put the book down as not of the real, but of the invented, sea. And when description is repeated and made a feature of, distrust it. It was written for the public and not for its own sake, as all true literature is or ought to be.

I have little to say, after mentioning Smollett, about the Navy. Though I did write one story about an Admiral, I know nothing of the Royal Navy. But there is one book which deals, and deals very well, with the sea generally and with naval officers of a time now passed by—Cupples' *Green Hand*. There is real knowledge there, though he depreciates the merchant seamen most unjustly in order to exalt naval officers. No doubt there were very rough dogs among merchant seamen, but even now there are a few rough dogs left in the Navy, and the elder service, the one which grew up with the country, contained, as it still contains, thousands of splendid and capable men. Still the *Green Hand* is well worth reading, for though it too is overloaded with descriptions of maritime scenery, they are observed and real pictures. Their one fault is a literary one. They are out of place in the mouth of a narrator, a thing too often forgotten by writers.

Something must be said of R. L. S. Stevenson took uncommon care about what he wrote, and obviously had the sense to get folks who knew to look over what he had done, so he rarely makes absurd howlers. And yet, so many are the

sea traps open to the wisest, he fell into more than one of them. When I met him in Apia the very year he died I asked him how it was that he came to write in *Treasure Island*:“ ‘Luff,’ said he, ‘and I put the helm up.’ ” His reply was that of Dr Johnson when he was asked why he defined a pastern as the knee of a horse, “Ignorance, sir, pure ignorance.” According to an old foc’sle gag he was in the same quandary as Moses, for that runs: “The Lord said unto Moses, ‘Luff!’ but Moses, not being a sailorman, put his helm hard up, ran his stem on the bulrushes, and became a total wreck.” Again, Stevenson plays hanky-panky with the compass, and even in *The Wreckers*, when he had more knowledge, or better help, he makes some obvious errors. Yet in that book the maritime parts are on the whole very good, and give us some true pictures of the sea and of some American seamen of the seventies and eighties. Brutes they were, almost without exception, but they knew their work and the medium in which they lived and worked.

And again what of modern and current sea-fiction when it is not the pure invented nonsense one finds in magazines? So far as the literature of sailing ships is concerned almost anything written is, in the slang of the studios, pure fake. However good it may seem to the landsman, it has not been lived. It cannot now be lived, and for the outsider to write as if he knew is fatal when those old ships are concerned. Those who do often remind me that when my brother, a very good seaman, was standing on a Chicago wharf he was approached by a loafer, hoping to engineer a drink, and asked if he was a sailor. When he said he was, this wharf rat remarked, “I’m a bit of a sailor myself.” On interrogation it turned out he had not been to sea, had not sailed on the lakes, nor even been in Mississippi steam-boats. “Then what in thunder did you do?” asked my brother. “Well, you see, it’s this way,” said this bit of a sailor himself, “I—I druv mules on the Wabash Canal.” There are not a few writers of that order about now.

Yet there are some sound enough stories written by a few men, and they are very few, who were, as they say nowadays, "in sail." And there is a growing literature of the steamship. One engineer at least is writing tales of the sea that may please. But can anything compensate us for the loss of the real "ship"?

For nowadays the old captains and the ships have departed, and with them much has been lost, even the beautiful old sea-language which no efforts of student sea-writers can restore. But even with steamships there must still be the terror of the seas to encounter, the heavy gales, the fogs and ice, and all those accidents which bring tragedy and its pain and pity and purification to the heart. Yet we may well sigh for the past, the past that is no more. In the last six years I have been over 60,000 miles in steamers and have seen—how many sailing-ships? Not one, nothing but four-masted or five-masted schooners, pure modern inventions without real beauty. We shall see no more going about their business in "tall waters" such ships as the *Cutty Sark*, though I rejoice to know she yet lives redeemed from alien crews, or the wonderful *Thermopylae*, or the *Fiery Cross* or *Flying Cloud*. Many of these I have known, but only the old *Cutty Sark* remains, and she will not again do the work of the seas. Never again shall I or any of us, it may be, come up with and pass, or perhaps be passed by, a full-rigged ship driving before the gale when she is running down her easting in the Roaring Forties. To see her lift and pitch and drive and thrust out her fore-foot forty feet under the grey-arched curve of her reefed fore-sail and topsails; to see the very scud of the skies down upon her stowed royals, as the grey-green seas are white with rolling spindrift, the foam of driven and tormented waters; to lift one's hand in greeting to the few upon her poop as we pass by—yes, what chance of this again? So it is well that some live and lively records of the ancient sea from which

we spring should be left to us. We find much in the grave and simple stories of the old navigators. Sometimes their very simplicity reaches strange heights of tragedy. But in their constant use of the sea they took its passions and perils for granted, and told us as little as they might, not knowing that we should hunger to learn what they felt and what they thought. This simplicity, this reticence, this sparing employment of detail must still mark the best work of the sea, as it marks all literature. We shall find it in all stories written by men who can tell us just the little more we wish to hear of those who went down to the sea in ships which now lie, as it were, at anchor in the ports of memory, with their bleached canvas harbour-furled.

HERMAN MELVILLE

BY MARY C. RITCHIE

WHEN Herman Melville sailed for England in the autumn of 1849 for the first time as a passenger, but one who as past master of the craft of the sea was free of every part of the ship, it seemed that he had reached a place in his life fulfilled with present security and happiness, and with rich promise for the future. He was then thirty, and in the five years since he had returned from following the seas of the world and from strange adventures in strange sunlit islands he had entered into his manhood. For, as Lewis Mumford points out in his admirable biography of Melville, 'the beginning of manhood' is 'when one realizes that adventure is as humdrum as routine unless one relates it to a central core, which grows within and gives contour and significance.' And this realization had borne fruit in four books already published—*Typee*, *Omoo*, *Mardi*, and *Redfern*, and a fifth that lay snug in his carpet-bag—*White Jacket*—which with *Redfern* he was taking to England. He must make the best possible terms with a publisher for, with a wife and a child, he was no longer a solitary adventurer. The interest he aroused in his fellow-passengers brought to him a certain satisfaction for, while his reputation was growing in England and the United States as well as in France and Germany, he was still a young author. He records in his diary how one lady reading his book, studied him covertly to see what manner of man it was who had lived with cannibals.

He had dreamed of England since the far-off days when his father had enthralled him as a child with the tales of his wandering in the old land and he had watched the packets sailing thither from the grey wharves of Manhattan. True,

there had been the nightmare visit of thirteen years ago when the lad of seventeen had landed penniless in the sordid Liverpool of the stranded sailor-man. But now how different seemed the pleasant country with its snug farms and gracious manor houses and the jolly inns that he had known in *Pickwick*! He reached London, cold and ravenous, after a journey in an open third class carriage and found a chop house where, as he digested the chops and porter and treacle pudding, he felt that he was really in 'England, Old England'. He looked about the grimy eating stall, at the red-cheeked, pert, kindly waitress, at the men, lawyers' clerks and countrymen, 'a faint odour of musty paper and soot over one kind of Londoner, or of ploughed fields and manure over the other', and felt London—'a society like that at Albany, bedded deep in dust, must, precedent and vast augmentations of gold. One is in it and out of it.'

He went through the streets peering with his little eyes, himself stared at, he felt, because of his green coat in a city where black was the only wear. He spent hours in the book-stalls where he picked up copies of folios of Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Thomas Brown, and De Quincy who reminded him of some of his own fancies in *Mardi*. For there were weeks of waiting before Bentley finally agreed to give him £200 for the first thousand copies of *White Jacket*. He had time for a short visit to the Continent, but it was London that entered into his soul. The colours—the crimson of Hampton Court, with its Titians and Van Dyks and Rembrandts; the golden haze of Piccadilly on a mellow autumn Sunday; the greys of St. Paul's and Bloomsbury—how they glowed against the darkness that was even then the background of his mind! To him the Lord Mayor's Show with its horrid aftermath of a horde of beggars pouring into the great hall to pick and grab at the remains of the feasting was fact and symbol. But as yet light and shadow were nicely balanced.

The people, living and dead, made a profound impression on his mind.

'How near one feels to the English, these people who like good solid food, and ale and port, who have a manly straightness in their dealings, merchants whose signature makes paper valuable, poets who have created in words poems that atone for all the pictures that remain unpainted and all the music that remains unsung in the English soul; hearty, robust, gay . . . but grave, serious and at bottom very deep; no one, not even Dante, had struck more ruthlessly at the sinister meaning of life than Shakespeare, no one had been more relentless than Swift or Hogarth—and yet with what tenderness, what warm love of life, in Swift's letters to Stella, or Hogarth's portrait of the Shrimp-girl, as fresh as a newly-opened flower. A country of sound men, buxom girls, beautiful tidy fields, snug inns—and terrible revealers of life's immense blackness. How intense the candle in these brave hands: how sullen and eventful the grave shadows that swarm around.'

Thus writes Mr. Mumford, drawing on the comments contained in Melville's diary, which show very clearly the spirit of the man, and his feeling of kinship with the English people, that was to have so strong an influence on his future fame. In our own day it has been a small group of English poets and critics who rescued him from the forgetfulness into which he had fallen.

True, the England of privilege had its 'Arctic Oh?' for Melville, and he wrote somewhat scornfully of the literary world into which his publisher and his strange and growing reputation plunged him. Poor Lockhart was 'a moth-eaten lion' and 'conventionalism, what a ninny thou art'! But Punch's funny man is 'a good fellow, no damned nonsense'; the Benchers at Temple Bar make up a Paradise of Bachelors; the dinner with Mr. Bates where he meets 'Lord Ashburton's nephew, and Baron This and Baroness That, and Mr. Peabody the Boston Merchant, where the glasses and silver are brilliant and the conversation ripples in reflection of it.'

Melville found it all very good. He would have accepted the Duke of Rutland's invitation to Belvoir Castle, but the longing for Lizzie and little Barney became overpowering. He set sail on a 'small ancient-looking wooden ship and in five weeks was at home again. But the joy of reunion was characteristically shortlived. In a fortnight he was wondering why he had hurried back and bitterly regretting his lost chance to visit English Aristocracy at its best.

On his homeward journey his mind had been bursting with a new book, and the need to begin work was pressing. In spite of Bentley's advance on *White Jacket* he was in debt and New York was too expensive. But the Berkshires were a second home to Melville. His father-in-law arranged 'a friendly mortgage' and he bought the farm, Arrowhead. It was after he began his life there as writer and farmer that he met Hawthorne, and knew the one great intellectual friendship of his life. Hawthorne's books, which he had read recently, moved him profoundly and stirred in him a great hope. If America could produce a Hawthorne with something akin to the deep vision of Shakespeare, why not a Melville? So the night's visit to the Hawthornes would be followed by the morning's letter, and Melville poured out his whole tempestuous heart and the wild imaginings of his brain to one who, as the future proved, gave nothing.

Here is Sophia Hawthorne's picture of the Melville of those days:—

'I am not sure that I do not think him a very great man. . . . A man with a true warm heart, and a soul and an intellect, with life to his finger tips; earnest, sincere, modest. He has very keen perceptive power but what astonishes me is that his eyes are not large and deep. He seems to see everything accurately; but how he does with his small eyes I can not tell. His nose is straight and handsome, his mouth expressive of sensibility and emotion. He is tall and erect with an air free,

brave, manly. When he is conversing he is full of gesture and force and loses himself in his subject. There is no grace or polish. Once in a while his animation gives place to a singularly quiet expression, out of those eyes . . . an indrawn dim look, but which at the same time makes you feel that he is at the moment taking deepest note. . . . It is a strange lazy glance, but with power in it quite unique. It does not seem to penetrate through you, but to take you into itself.'

This is the man who at that time began to write *Moby-Dick*. With what vigour, with what courage, stimulated greatly by his generous reception in England, he went at his work! And with a mind how crowded! 'Send me,' he wrote to his kindly publisher, Mr. Duyckinck, 'fifty fast writing youths.' He might set them all at work. Instead he packed the material for many books into one.

It was in the autumn of 1850 that he began to write in an ever growing fever of creation. The chores of the farm had to be done; the horse and cow must be fed. Then to his room to work until with the afternoon the farm claimed him again, but always, we may be sure, with his great theme tearing at his mind. As the winter deepened he worked harder and harder. The light of his northern window tried his small eyes. One failed him; he went on 'blinking' with the other. And it is not only the book that consumes him, but:—

'the primitive elementalizing of the strange stuff, which in the act of attempting the book has upheaved and upgushed in his soul. Two books are being writ; of which the world shall see but one and that the bungled one. The larger book and the infinitely better is for his own private shelf. That it is whose unfathomable cravings drank his blood; the other only demands ink'.

The spring found him weary in body and mind. There were days when he never left his desk and yet not a word could he write. When the evening released him 'in the spring twilight he creeps about like an owl.' 'But,' says Mr. Mum-

ford, 'in the midst of his writing, his soul reaches a pitch of exaltation, and his letters to Hawthorne are prophetic and deep and full of a proud mastery.'

The book was finished in the steaming summer heat of New York where he had gone to escape the claims of his farm and his family, and it was published by Bentley (in England) and by Harpers. The result for him was obscurity until his life's end—obscurity at first pitiful with exhaustion or stormy with pain, and then quiescent, and finally peacefully happy. But to-day, as Mr. Mumford expresses it, 'he lives for us not because he painted South Sea Rainbows, or rectified abuses in authority in the United States Navy; he lives because he grappled with certain great dilemmas in man's spiritual life; and in seeking to answer them sounded bottom'; in short, because he wrote *Moby-Dick*.

To understand the Melville who in the fullness of his creative powers wrote his one great masterpiece, it is necessary to go back to the beginning of his life. For only the story of his early years can explain him as man and as author. This story, based throughout on Mr. Mumford's biography, must be told briefly.

Herman Melville was born in 1819, in a New York that was as yet but 'a neat provincial town,' and into a society of somewhat local tradition of which family was the very centre. There was about Melville's family a distinct patrician flavour. Oliver Wendell Holmes has left us a picture of Thomas Melville, the grandfather:

They say that in his prime
Ere the pruning knife of time
Cut him down,
Not a better man was found
By the Crier on his round
Through the town.

My grandmama has said—
Poor old lady she is dead
Long ago—
That he had a Roman nose
And his cheek was like a rose
In the snow.

But now to the kindly Autocrat the old man is the last
leaf, clinging to his deserted bough, the object of kindly mirth,

But the old three-cornered hat,
And the breeches and all that
Are so queer!

Something of Thomas Melville's spirit lived on in his son and
his grandson.

On his mother's side Herman Melville was a Gansevoort, one of the old Dutch families, great landed proprietors who dwelt on their broad acres on the Hudson, in Gansevoort, a mellow old house built of bricks brought long ago from the Netherlands. If his mother was proud of two hundred years of assured position, if she valued 'good food, low voices, courteous servants, correct manners,' all these amenities played their part in making little Herman and it was only when he grew older that he realized her coldness. As for his father Allan, who had stooped a little to become a trader in French goods, we know that his tales of travel stimulated the boy's mind, and we have a picture of a memorable day, when the father took the little lad to Staten Island to explore a ruined fort, with an amazing uncle who had sailed to Archangel and crossed Russia from the Sea of Okhotsk to St. Petersburg by dog-sledges. Added to all this there were the ships sailing from Manhattan to the strange old world of which his father told. No wonder the boy dreamed dreams. And these dreams were woven into the fabric of his mind in very early days during long months of illness, for Melville was a delicate little boy. We know that Allan grieved for him, and he has left

us a curious picture of the child of six, backward because of ill health, 'but . . . as far as he understands men and things both solid and profound.' Because of his delicacy Herman spent long months with the Gansevoorts in Albany and at Gansevoort, and with his Melville relations in the Berkshires. So that he became a strapping fellow with roots that struck deep into the countryside.

Suddenly this happy life was broken to pieces. Allan Melville failed in his business and died, leaving his widow and their eight children to a poverty that was pinching. And Herman, grieving deeply for a father he then idolized, found his rosy dreams lost in a grim present. It was not only the struggle of those years but a bitter disappointment in those who had seemed to him so kind that left an indelible impression on the lad's mind, for the Gansevoorts while sympathetic in words were not generous. Young Herman, after a few months as clerk in a bank of which his uncle was president, joined his brother Gansevoort who with pathetic courage was trying to support his family by a hat shop. But the business was not productive and Herman at sixteen taught school during the winter in a Berkshire village and in the summer worked on his uncle's farm until a passion of homesickness sent him back to his mother. But her larder was bare and her welcome chilling. The boy therefore resolved to travel, if not as his father had done, then possibly in one of the ships that sailed from New York. In part from necessity, in part in the spirit of adventure, in part to cut a dash with his sisters, he shipped for Liverpool on the *Highlander* as a sailor before the mast. But there was bitterness in his spirit and he felt himself 'an infant Ishmael, driven out into the desert, with no maternal Hagar to comfort him.'

Until he joined the *Highlander*, his life had been as sheltered from evil as the lives of his sisters. All unprepared he was plunged into the rough life of a forecastle, dominated by

a depraved and dying bully. Liverpool gave him some happy hours when he explored the great East India merchant ships with their strange cargoes and stranger crews, but it gave him freely of its horrors. And this sudden plunge into a knowledge of vice and degradation and cruelty left poisoning memories which were to deepen the gloom of his dark days and cast a shadow over his happiest hours. Cheated of his wages, he returned to New York as poor as when he set sail. But he had learned something of ships and of men, their rough kindness and their courage as well as their coarseness, and he had known unforgettable moments when the sails and the whole ship had made answer to the swelling breeze:

‘Then I was first conscious of a wonderful thing in me, that responded to all the wild commotion of the outer world and went reeling on and on with the planets in their orbits, and was lost in one delicious thrill in the centre of the all.’

Nevertheless, school-teaching seemed for the moment a very haven, and school-teacher Melville remained for three years. During this time he published some commonplace and discursive articles interesting only because of references to his reading—to Chesterfield, Milton, Byron, Scott, Coleridge, and among Americans, to Cooper whom he always admired. Dana’s book, *Two Years Before the Mast*, was published in 1840. Melville wrote of this book in *Moby-Dick* and it is possible that Dana’s account of the long voyage round the Horn and of adventures in Southern Seas stirred in Melville’s mind those imaginings about the great whale that made of him a whalesman. But without doubt the boy was in love with the sea. ‘*Moby-Dick*’, writes Masefield, ‘tells the whole secret of the sea.’ And there are scores of passages in the book that could have been written only by a poet and sea-lover. The wonder is that he stayed in his Berkshire village so long.

He sailed from New Bedford in mid-winter on the *Acushnet* with an ill-fated crew. He must have signed on for

the voyage with his 'lay' or share agreed upon in advance. But a year and a half later, with no prospect of the end of the voyage in sight, and utterly weary of the hardships and the dull routine, he and one 'Toby' deserted when the crew were landed for water on one of the Marquesas, and after terrible adventures fell into the hands of the Typees, a tribe whose name means 'man-eaters'. Toby escaped from them to bring rescue to a badly lamed Melville, but he never returned. Then began for Herman idyllic months. True, there were uncertainties. Where was Toby? Was his servant, 'as faithful as Sancho Panza,' attendant or guard? Was he to be an honoured guest or a part of the menu at the next ritual feast? But these doubts slipped into the background of his mind. He spent long hours lazily drifting in a canoe with the lovely dusky maiden, Fayaway. He had interesting talks with the chiefs who were his friends. A lazy, easy, entirely effortless life, with laughter and song and beauty. The beauty of the surf beating against the cliffs, of rich valleys and bare spurs of mountains, of splendid nude bodies. A country without inhibitions save its strange taboos. But it could not hold him. The Typees would have made him one of themselves, marking him as their own by intricate tatooing, but he escaped from them, not without bloodshed. These idyllic months lived again in his book *Typee*.

'If by any possibility,' Melville wrote in *Moby-Dick*, 'there be any as yet undiscovered thing in me; if I shall ever deserve any real repute in that small, but high-hushed world which I might not unreasonably be ambitious of; if hereafter I shall do anything that upon the whole a man might rather have done than left undone; if at my death my executors or more properly my creditors find any precious MSS. in my desk, then here I prospectively ascribe all the honour and glory to whaling; for a whale ship was my Yale College and Harvard.' On the whaling ship *Jule*, with a weak land-lubber of

a captain, and an efficient mate who was generally half-seas over, Melville's education advanced by leaps and bounds. For on the *Jule* he met a strange creature, the ship's doctor, 'Dr. Long Ghost,' who had broken with the cabin to throw in his lot with the fore-castle. He and Melville coalesced 'as one globule of mercury with another.' Here is his picture:

'He had certainly at some time or other spent money, drunk Burgundy and associated with gentlemen. As for his learning he quoted Virgil and talked of Hobbes of Malmesbury, besides repeating poetry by the canto, especially *Hudibras*. He was moreover a man who had seen the world. In the easiest possible manner he could refer to an amour he had in Palermo, his lion hunting before breakfast with the Caffres, and the quality of coffee he had drunk in Muscat.'

'Such a man,' says Mumford, 'was himself a picaresque library and he who ran with him had much to read.'

The captain fell ill, and the *Jule* anchored off one of the Society Islands to land him. The crew refused to sail with the drunken mate and appealed to the British Consul. He treated them as mutineers, and Melville knew five days of imprisonment on a French man-of-war as well as some weeks of semi-confinement in an English jail. His guard was a huge Polynesian. The *Jule* sailed without him and for months he and Dr. Long Ghost lived a life as confused as a dream. At times working for a Yankee farmer, at times seeking preferment at the court of Queen Pomaree of Tahiti, they drifted from one islet to another living a life 'of rambling and laziness and observation' of which *Omoo* expresses the reality and *Mardi* the dream.

Of his experiences in a third whaling ship off the coast of Japan, Melville has told us little. For a few months he worked in Honolulu; then, the call of home becoming as insistent as had been the call of the sea, he enlisted on the homeward-bound frigate *United States*. Melville was again penniless; unable to secure a pea-jacket from the purser and quite unable to

buy one, he made for himself a jacket of white duck, folded and padded, which gave its name to the book in which he records these experiences, but which, without the dash of paint that was denied him, proved useless in cold weather and much worse than useless in wet for it was as absorbent as a sponge. His terrible sufferings as the ship rounded the Horn were probably the cause of the rheumatism that made him 'a rapidly ageing man at thirty-seven.'

But in spite of its hardships the homeward journey was a happy time for Melville and *White Jacket* is full of buoyant humour. After his wanderings among the natives the crowded life of the ship was full of interest. And in the library Melville found books that fed his very soul. Walpole's letters, *The Jew of Malta*, and *Volpone*, as well as earlier books of travel and adventure, Morgan's *History of Algiers*, and Knox's *Captivity in Ceylon*. 'These books,' says Mr. Mumford, 'give his literary pedigree.' The Elizabethans with 'their untrammelled emotions, their stertorous vitality, and their transposition of dream into reality and reality into dream' had a profound influence upon his growth, so too had Knox's *Captivity*, 'direct, honest and well ballasted.' But his happiest hours were lived high aloft, with the gallant English sailor Jack Chase, a simple, hearty, splendid fellow, whose friendship Melville treasured in memory until his life's end. Gallant sailor that he was, Chase was much more; he had a passion for Camöens and could recite *The Luciad* by heart. In exchange, we may be sure, Melville poured out the tale of his wanderings, not only to Chase but to the eager members of his mess. He soon learned what was boring, what was superfluous, with the result that in *Typee* the redundancy and affectations of his boyish writing disappear. *White Jacket* reveals the cruelty and degradation of the practice of flogging in the navy as felt by Melville. On one occasion, for his failure to take a position in general stations that he had not known had been assigned

to him, he found himself threatened with this horrible punishment; he measured his distance from the captain, and from the captain to the ship's side, as he contemplated murder and suicide. But a plea from a comrade, and probably his own willingness and strength since the voyage began, won him his pardon; and though he was nearly drowned when he fell overboard, weighed down by the detested white jacket (which he then lost forever) he landed in Boston in 1844, still an Ishmael among his fellows, but proved by the test of the most rigorous experience.

Melville returned to find his country already undergoing the changes that were to leave him something of an alien in the land of his birth. The old provincial spirit based on the land was giving way to the commercial spirit. But before it passed it had produced a creative impulse that blossomed into a literature as yet unequalled in America. He found his family re-established; Gansevoort had left his hat shop for the diplomatic service; Allan was a rising young lawyer; Tom had chosen the sea as a profession, but not by way of the fore-castle. The bond between the Melvilles was always strong; in their renewed prosperity his family welcomed but may have looked a little askance at the young adventurer who returned seemingly empty-handed, for the sheaves golden and glowing that he bore with him were invisible to their eyes. But Herman Melville's vocation had found him. The success of *Typee* and *Omoo*, whose innocent frankness may have shocked his relations, doubtless reassured them, as did his friendship with Elizabeth, daughter of their old friend Chief Justice Shaw, which ripened into love and marriage.

The young people began their married life in New York, sharing their home with Allan and a 'swarm of sisters.' At twenty-eight, to outward seeming, Melville was still a high-hearted boy, but hard years lay before the loving but simple-minded girl that he had married. It is true she never gave

him the mental companionship that Hawthorne found in his Sophia. So poor a housekeeper was she that his mother and sisters had to share their life at Arrowhead, and she fretted him with her worries about the children. But through his dark days of exhaustion and disappointment (though never of surrender) when his harshness and his boisterous humour alike repelled his children, when his friendship with Hawthorne tragically failed and he remained a friendless man, her love for him and her belief in him never faltered. To the end she gave him unfailing tenderness. And he tried her sorely not only with his bleak despair but with his uncertainties; when he was away from her, he longed for her; when they were reunited he soon wearied of her. It is a comfort to know that when at last he struggled through the bitter years to resignation and contentment he returned her love with kindness and affection.

But these sad years were as yet hidden from them, and *Mardi*, written in the first year of their marriage, is full of languorous content. True, it is a book that changed and deepened; it began as a more poetic *Omoo*; it ended as a tale of spiritual adventure, and for the first time brought upon Melville the charge of obscurity. But *Redfern*, the story of his boyhood, although showing strains of bitterness, reassured his public. *White Jacket* was a widely discussed book. It was therefore with a sound confidence that Melville settled down to his desk in the attic whose northern windows looked across a country aflame with autumn towards Mt. Monadnock, his unchanging friend, to write his profoundly revealing letters to Hawthorne, and, hour after hour, to pour out all the wealth of his experiences, all his philosophy of life, all the poetry of his soul in his one great masterpiece, *Moby-Dick*.

Moby-Dick is above all else a story of the sea, 'and the sea is life whose waters of deep woe are brackish with the salt of tears.' But there is intense human and dramatic interest

in the book, and this lies in the relentless chase of Moby-Dick, and the final tremendous encounters between him and Captain Ahab. Not only thrilling in themselves, the chase and the encounters are the outcome and the expression of the lust for revenge against the Great White Whale, that burnt like madness in the soul of that 'grand, ungodly, god-like man.' And from the distorted character of the mighty Ahab, the tragedy is inevitable and far-reaching.

But apart from the human interest, the book with its descriptions of whales (above all of the greatest of all whales, the sperm whale) is an epic. For surely Melville is the man who 'has dared to draw out Leviathan with a hook'. For by the might of his imagination we see the monstrous fish; at times passing through the paths of the sea, from Ocean to Ocean girdling the world; at times rising to the surface of the Southern waters, blowing high his steaming spout; at times with his ninety feet of hugeness lashed to the ship's side in a horrid welter of blood and oil; at times in all the fury of his fight with man, until in dying he turns his lashless eyes to the sun in a last farewell.

'Call me Ishmael,' so begins the story, and he of the suggestive name is one who whenever he had felt himself 'grow grim about the mouth' had left his schoolmaster's desk to follow the sea as a sailor before the mast. But now his mind is full of strange imaginings of whales, above all of a 'great white whale', and of those seas 'in which he rolls his inland bulk,' and so he is determined to embark on the hard adventure of whaling, and only a ship from Old Nantucket will serve his romantic turn. As Ishmael, Melville lingers over his own experiences, but the teller of the tale is far removed from the lad who sailed on the *Acushnet*. New Bedford and Nantucket, the old and the new capitals of the American whale fisheries; the cheerless inns; the whalesmen's chapel with its grim

memorial tablets; the wonderful and prophetic sermon of Father Mapple on Jonah and the whale; these are all pertinent to the story. So too are the strange couple, Peleg and Bildad, retired whaling captains and now part owners, outfitters and temporary commanders of that noble and melancholy ship, the *Pequod*. Quakers both but with a difference; Peleg, 'a swearing man' who used 'his toe freely on the rear of the sailors' and believed a good harpooner 'must be pretty sharkish'; old Bildad, 'an intense Quaker' poring over his Bible, and beating down poor Ishmael's 'lay' with a text. But in Peleg's eye a tear twinkled when the time came to say good-bye. And could a volume give a better picture of this type of Quaker mind than Captain Bildad's broken farewell:

'God bless ye and have ye in his holy keeping. . . . Be careful in the hunts ye mates. . . . Don't stave the boats needlessly ye harpooners; good white cedar plank is raised full three per cent. . . . Don't forget your prayers either. . . . Mr. Starbuck, mind that cooper don't waste the spare staves. . . . Don't whale it too much a' Lord's Day, men; but don't miss a fair chance either for that's rejecting heaven's good gifts. . . . If ye touch at the Islands, Mr. Flask, beware of fornication. Good-bye, good-bye. Don't keep that cheese too long in the hold. . . . Be careful of the butter—twenty cents the pound it was, and mind ye if . . .'

Peleg hurried him into the tossing pilot boat; the two hulls rolled apart; a gull screamed overhead and in the early darkness of that Christmas afternoon the crew of the *Pequod* with 'three heavy-hearted cheers plunged like fate into the lone Atlantic.'

Now while the officers of the *Pequod* were all down-east Yankees, the crew was a strange and fantastic motley. And into the strangest of them—the little, crazed, black Pip, whose devotion well nigh turned the mighty Ahab from his purpose, and the three harpooners, Tashtego, Daggoo, and Queequeg—Melville breathed the very breath of life. It was in the New

Bedford Inn that Ishmael, himself 'born and bred in the bosom of the infallible Presbyterian Church', looked up with startled sleepy eyes at his prospective bed-fellow, Queequeg, with his purple-yellow face crowned by a new beaver hat and with his harpoon and a shrivelled human head in his hand, and, finding in him a bosom friend, worshipped with him in the spirit of Christian charity the small black graven image Youjo, the god in whom the South Sea Islander trusted, And to Queequeg, with his royal blood 'sadly vitiated by the cannibal propensities of his untutored youth', with his swift justice to the insulting bumpkin, and his plunge into the black icy water to rescue his insulter, the soul of Ishmael clung 'like a barnacle until poor Queequeg took his last long dive.'

As in the days of chivalry each knight had his squire so in the whale fisheries each mate had his harpooner, and the knight that Queequeg served was Starbuck, the first mate. He was a long, lean, earnest young Quaker, and in the stern Ahab's estimation 'the best lance out of all Nantucket'. Yet he was a careful man who felt that courage was too much a staple in the business of whaling to need proving. But with the simplicity of his bravery there went a something that made him different to the ever-jolly, ever pipe-smoking Stubbs, and to the little third mate, Flask. A father killed, a brother mutilated in the whale fisheries brought to him sad memories, and his heart reached back longingly to the young wife and the little boy that he had left behind him, (as too had Ahab). These memories and longings tinged with melancholy and imagination that knew 'outer portents and inner presentiments'. And while his was a bravery that could meet all the perils of his calling, all the horrors of wind or sea or whale, to his imaginative soul the spiritual struggle was ever the most terrible. And such lay before him against the lofty but dark and blasted Ahab, with his brow riven as by lightning and his heart and mind consumed by a madness of hatred, a hatred which was

treason to all that Nantucket stood for, to the old Quaker owners and to every man of the crew.

And now the stage is set. Nantucket far behind; the mastheads manned, ready by day or night 'to raise a whale' until the last cask be brimming with oil. It was evening. Captain Ahab had called every man aft to where he stood leaning against a bulwark, his ivory leg braced in a prepared auger hole. The whole man 'looked not unlike the weather horizon when a storm is coming'. His strange manner, his wild, excited questions stir to a sudden fervour the wild crew. Thrilled by their response to his mood, the old man nailed to the mast a gleaming golden doubloon:

'Look ye! Do ye see this Spanish ounce of gold? Who-soever of ye raises me a white-headed whale with a wrinkled brow and a crooked jaw; whosoever raises me that white-headed whale, with three holes punctured in his starboard fluke, he shall have this gold ounce, my boy!'

'Captain Ahab,' said Tashtego, 'that white whale must be the same that some call Moby-Dick.'

'Moby-Dick'? shouted Ahab. 'Do ye know the white whale, then, Tash?'

'Does he fan-tail a little curious, sir, before he goes down?' said the Gay-header deliberately.

'And has he a curious spout, too,' said Daggoo, 'very bushy even for a parmacetty, and mighty quick, Captain Ahab?'

'And he have one, two, tree—oh! good many iron in him hide, too, Captain,' cried Queequeg disjointedly, 'all twiske-tee be-twisk, like him—him—' faltering hard for a word, and screwing his hand round and round as though uncorking a bottle—like him—him—'

'Corkscrew!' cried Ahab, 'aye, Queequeg, the harpoons lie all twisted and wrenched in him; aye, Daggoo, his spout is a big one, like a whole shock of wheat, and white as a pile of our Nantucket wool; aye, Tashtego, and he fan-tails like a split jib in a squall. Death and devils! men, it is Moby-Dick ye have seen—Moby-Dick—Moby-Dick!'

'Captain Ahab,' said Starbuck, 'Captain Ahab, I have heard of Moby-Dick—but it was not Moby-Dick that took off thy leg?'

'Who told thee that?' cried Ahab; then pausing, 'Aye, Starbuck; aye, my hearties all round; it was Moby-Dick that dismasted me; Moby-Dick that brought me to this dead stump I stand on now. Aye, aye,' he shouted with a terrific, loud, animal sob, like that of a heart-stricken moose; 'Aye, aye! it was that accursed white whale that razed me; made a poor pegging lubber of me for ever and a day!' Then tossing both hands with measureless imprecations he shouted out: 'Aye, aye! and I'll chase him round Good Hope, and round the Horn, and round the Norway Maelstrom, and round perdition's flames before I give him up. And this is what ye have shipped for, men! to chase that white whale on both sides of land, and over all sides of earth, till he spouts black blood and rolls fin out. What say ye, men, will ye splice hands on it, now? I think ye do look brave.'

'Aye, aye!' shouted the harpooners and seamen, running closer to the excited old man: 'A sharp eye for the white whale; a sharp lance for Moby-Dick!'

And so the mad oath is taken; the wild pledges go round. Can the jolly Stubbs or little Flask oppose the mighty Ahab with the crew 'one and all' supporting him? True, poor Starbuck struggles with his sane but 'unaided bravery'. But he too is dominated by a madness that he knows as madness; and the *Pequod* is sealed to her inexorable though far-off fate.

For the book moves on more deliberately than before. We are shown every part of the great fish, from the enormous 'faceless' head to the sensitive flukes of the devastating tail. We weigh the huge bulk, which equals a village of more than a thousand people; one by one we count each bone in the sun-bleached skeleton. We watch the Harem School, with its old Turk of a schoolmaster, and the schools of the young bulls. And most amazing of all, we are towed in a swift following boat by a stricken whale, through the frenzied ranks of a panic-smitten army of sperm whales to find in its centre a

complete peace, and to look down through the 'calm lake' and see a mother suckling her day old baby (of 14 feet) with its tail and fins wrinkled like a new born baby's ears, and its placid baby eyes looking up through the still waters. We watch, too, the whalesman about his business, from the time the whale 'is raised' from the masthead until the fire crackles under the try-pot, and we too choke in the acrid, black smoke. A book amazing in its scope:

'For,' says Melville, 'in the mere act of penning my thoughts of this Leviathan, they weary me, and make me faint with their outreaching comprehensiveness of sweep, as if to include the whole circle of sciences and all generations of whales, and men, and mastodons, past, present and to come, with all the revolving panoramas of empire on earth . . . such and so magnifying is the virtue of a large and liberal theme. . .'

And thus the book moves on, wise, tolerant and enlarging, while the *Pequod* sails round the Cape of Good Hope, through the calm of the Indian Ocean, past the musk smelling islands in the Japanese Sea, into the madness of the typhoon with its strange and terrible omens. And then southward towards the Line when fearful tales of Moby-Dick come to her captain from passing whale ships until at last, from her highest mast-head to which he had been hoisted, Ahab himself 'raises' the great white whale.

And then:

'With Ahab heading the onset . . . like noiseless nautilus shells, their light prows sped through the sea. . . . As they neared him, the ocean grew still more smooth; seemed drawing a carpet over its waves; seemed a noon-meadow, so serenely it spread. At length . . . his entire dazzling hump was distinctly visible, sliding along the sea as if an isolated thing, and continually set in a revolving ring of finest, fleecy, greenish foam. He (Ahab) saw the vast envolved wrinkles of the slightly projecting head beyond. Before it, far out on the soft Turkish-rugged waters, went the glistening white shadow from his broad milky forehead, a musical rippling playfully

accompanying the shade; and behind the blue water interchangeably flowed over into the moving valley of his steady wake; and on either hand bright bubbles arose and danced by his side. . . . And thus through the serene tranquility of the tropical sea Moby-Dick moved on, still withholding from sight the full terrors of his submerged trunk, entirely hiding the wrenched hideousness of his jaw. . . . But soon the forepart of him slowly rose from the water; for an instant his whole marbleized body formed a high arch, like Virginia's Natural Bridge, and warningly waving his bannered flukes in the air, the grand god revealed himself, sounded and went out of sight.'

And now began three days of shattering fight, of clearly thought-out, obstinate pursuit. On the first day Ahab's boat was crushed in the whale's huge jaws, and he himself only saved as he struggled, crippled in the water by Starbuck who interposed the *Pequod* between his captain and the on-coming whale.

On the second day the great whale 'breached' close to the pursuing ship, and in his audacious defiance gambolled before it like a salmon. Then as the lowered boats approached him he dashed upon them. Fiercely the three harpoons were darted; but the whale, 'in his untraceable evolutions, crossed and re-crossed and in a thousand ways entangled the slack of the three lines now fast to him' and so warped the boats towards the planted irons. In the wild confusion Ahab cut his rope, but the mates' boats in the next mad rush were drawn close to the great flukes and dashed together 'like husks on a surf-beaten beach.' And then the great whale, shooting straight from the sea, dashed his great forehead against the bottom of Ahab's boat and flung it towards heaven. But though again rescued by Starbuck, Ahab's ivory leg had been wrenched off, and one of his crew was missing, the Parsee, Ahab's harpooner and strange familiar, who had foretold that he must go before his master to death and then return to claim

him ere Ahab can die by 'the gallows'—the hempen rope—which only can destroy him.

And then on the evening of the fateful third day the waters upheaved as from 'a submerged iceberg,' and with a 'low rumbling, a subterranean hum, bedraggled with trailing ropes and harpoons and lances, a vast form shot lengthwise but obliquely from the sea' and then crashed back into the water. The boats darted forward. Moby-Dick waited not their coming but, maddened by pain, dashed between the mates' boats and shattered them apart; and as he turned his huge flank towards them they saw, lashed to his body by a tangle of lost lines, the torn corpse of the Parsee with dead staring eyes turned full upon Ahab. For a moment the harpoon dropped from the old man's hand. And in that moment the whale turned from them and, as if these encounters had been but incidents in his leeward journey, began again 'to pursue his own straight path in the sea'. In vain Starbuck from the deck of the close-following *Pequod* made his last plea. 'Not too late is it to desist. See, Moby-Dick seeks thee not. It is thou, thou that madly seekest him!' But Ahab's lonely boat was again urged forward, and his 'fierce steel and fiercer curse' plunged deep into the hated whale. The line snapped. And Moby-Dick again faced his foe. But in that instant he saw the *Pequod*, and, whether he felt that in her was the very source of his bitter persecution or that in his arrogant strength he sought a more worthy foe, at sight of her he turned from the now foundering boat and with incredible swiftness dashed 'the solid white buttress of his forehead' against the bow of the ship. And the fated crew heard the water pour through the breach like a mountain torrent.

And now Ahab, denied even the captain's last, sad consolation, saw the stout ship that his madness had betrayed, with his red flag (with the imprisoned bird of heaven) still fluttering from her peak, and with every mast-head manned,

sinking before his eyes. In a last wild effort he darted his last spear. He stooped to clear it but the flying turn caught him about the neck and dragged him into the water to follow his harpooner, captives both of *Moby-Dick*.

Over the gulf that had swallowed together the brave ship and the shattered boat the waves beat sullenly, until all collapsed and 'the great shroud of the sea rolled on as it rolled five thousand years ago'. And Ishmael, clinging to the coffin-buoy through the loneliness of night and day and night, alone was rescued to give to us the story and to become a strange and prophetic symbol of the great book's fate.

What of the inner spirit of the book?

'*Moby-Dick*,' wrote Viola Meynell, 'is the wildest, farthest kind of genius. In this book the reader is carried to the comprehensible limit of marvellous invention'. No wonder that critic after critic has assayed with only partial success to pluck out the heart of its mystery. Some readers, neither critics nor philosophers, will feel their souls uplifted by the mighty sweep of a poetry surely unapproached in the literature of this continent in this epic in which the clear, strong prose of the descriptions of whales and whaling supplies ballast and contrast. To them the generous and tolerant spirit of the book, so magnificently expressed throughout, will bring a healing as might great mountains or wide stretches of ocean. Others will dwell on the deep, religious thought of the book; on its profound philosophy of life; or will see in it a tremendous allegory. Nowhere does the religious spirit find such definite expression as in Father Mapple's sermon. Here is the splendid ending:

But, oh! Shipmates! on the starboard hand of every woe there is sure delight; and higher the top of that delight than the bottom of that woe is deep. Is not the maintruck higher than the kelson is low? Delight is to him—a far, far upward and inward delight—who against the proud gods and commodores of the earth, ever stands forth his inexorable self. De-

light is to him whose strong arms yet support him, when the ship of this base treacherous world goes down beneath him. . . . Delight, top-gallant delight is to him who acknowledges no law or lord, but the Lord his God, and is only patriot to heaven. Delight is to him whom all the waves and billows of the seas of the boisterous mob can never shake from this sure Keel of the Ages. And eternal delight and deliciousness will be his, who coming to lay him down can say with his final breath, O Father!—chiefly known to me by thy rod—mortal or immortal here I die. I have striven to be thine, more than to be this world's or my own. Yet this is nothing; I leave eternity to thee; for what is man that he should live out the lifetime of his God?

As a proof of Melville's profound meditation on life, and to show that there was in him 'the living stuff of philosophy'. Mr. Mumford in his book *The Golden Age* quotes almost in full a very striking and beautiful passage. In the half dreaming haze of a tropic afternoon, Ishmael and Queequeg were together making a 'sword mat':

'As I kept on passing and repassing the filling or woof of marline between the long yarns of the warp, using my hand for a shuttle . . . it seemed as if this were the Loom of Time, and I myself were a shuttle mechanically weaving away at the Fates. There lay the fixed threads of the warp subject to but one single, ever returning, unceasing vibration, and that vibration merely enough to admit of the crosswise interbinding of other threads with its own. The warp seemed necessity, and here, thought I, with my own hand I ply my own shuttle and weave my own destiny into these unalterable threads. Meantime Queequeg's impulsive, indifferent sword, sometimes hitting the woof slantingly, or crookedly, or strongly, or weakly, as the case might be; and by this difference in the concluding blow producing a corresponding difference in the final aspect of the completed fabric; this savage's sword, thought I, which thus finally shapes and fashions both warp and woof; this easy, indifferent sword must be chance—aye, chance, free will, and necessity—nowise incompatible, all interweavingly working together. The straight warp of necessity, not to be swerved

from its ultimate course—its ever alternating vibration, indeed, only tending to that; free will still free to ply the shuttle between given threads; and chance though restricted in its play within the right lines of necessity and sideways in its motions directed by free will, though thus prescribed to by both, chance by turn rules either, and has the last featuring blow at event.'

But the inner meaning of the book is yet to seek. In *The Golden Age*, Mr. Mumford briefly developed the theory that *Moby-Dick* was a tremendous allegory; that the whale, pursued by the whalesmen, and escaping at times but again overcome and lashed to the ship's side and from whose dead body they drew a richness of oil and bone, was nature, the universe; but that the Great White Whale whose very whiteness 'strikes more of panic to the soul than that redness that affrights the blood' was that nature, catastrophic, unconquerable, against which man may struggle in a heroic madness but which must not only dash him to defeat and death but in the struggle must change his spirit into the likeness of its own. The Great White Whale is at times nature in the most terrible shape; again it is the universe itself, and Ahab's struggle is the mad and heroic conflict with nature in this most awful form. Many readers will fail to agree fully with this interesting theory. To them the book is a great tragedy of character. They have a feeling of acquiescence in the poetic justice of the ending; and they believe that had Ahab overcome his mighty adversary there had been no assuagement of the horror in his soul. Such readers may recognize a recurring allegorical meaning and yet think that in his later work Mr. Mumford has gone too far in his attempt to compress Melville's wild and mighty genius into the forms of any theory.

There can be no doubt that *Moby-Dick* was the supreme spiritual adventure of Melville's life. To him 'the spiritual struggle' was 'ever the most terrible'. No theory of life or of art satisfied him unless it recognized and expressed the dark

side of existence. Even in his happiest days this darkness was the background of his mind and of his imagination. And into a spiritual struggle; into the darkness of his imagination; into the blackness of his own tormented spirit he plunged in *Moby-Dick* 'plummet deep'. It may well be that his 'wilful morbidity' was the outcome of his early and embittering experiences. As Mr. Van Wyck Brooks writes: 'I think it not unreasonable to suggest that in Captain Ahab's vindictive hatred of the white whale that symbolized life, Melville vented the accumulated fund of bitterness, the sorrowful anger of hurt pride, the spleen, the defiant contempt that rankled in his own heart.'

But be the meaning what it may, the great struggle, drawn to a scale larger than life, is Homeric. And against the mighty and tortured spirit of Ahab, the Great White Whale, *Moby-Dick*, stands forth the fitting and worthy antagonist. And the thoughtful reader of Melville in this tremendous book will find with Viola Meynell 'that to know him is to be partly made of him forever.'

LA POLITIQUE FRANÇAISE

BY PIERRE BERNUS

FRENCH internal politics are certainly hard for foreigners to understand. Their apparent complicatedness is due in large part to the fact that, contrary to what exists in certain other countries such as Great Britain and the United States, there is not in France any definite well-organized party, with the possible exception of the Socialists. The Chamber is divided into a great number of political groups several of which differ only in name, and this state of affairs is favourable to all kinds of more or less obscure manœuvring. Before indicating the present political situation as a whole it would be well first to describe the composition of the present Chamber of Deputies itself.

On the extreme right of the Chamber, then, there are a number of monarchists or nationalists, who usually style themselves Independents, and on the extreme left a Communist group twelve in number. Neither of these groups plays any but the most trivial of rôles in a house of 614 members. The right of the Chamber consists of the moderate or Conservative Republicans, whose attitude is above all things anti-socialist. On the left there are Socialists, Independent Socialists and Radical Socialists, who, without being at present exactly allies, yet generally vote together. Between them there are several so-called centre groups,¹ which according to whether they swing to the right or the left decide whether the government is of a Republican or Socialist tendency. In the House elected in 1924 (the Herriot Ministry) the Radical-Socialists and the Socialists had formed a combine and, thanks to the support of

Left	Right
¹ Communists, Socialists, Ind. Socialists, Radical Socialists.	Conservative Republicans, Monarchists.

a centre group, they were able to remain in power—although the Socialists did not hold office in the cabinet—until their financial policy provoked a formidable monetary crisis. In the summer of 1926 M. Poincaré formed a coalition government, which was opposed only by the Socialists and a few isolated Radical-Socialists.

The general elections of 1928 (the House is elected for four years) reinforced the right wing elements and especially those of the centre. In November, 1928, the Radical-Socialists, who had supported M. Poincaré, left him and passed over to the opposition. Thanks, however, to the increase in moderate deputies the cabinet got on without them. At the end of July, 1929, illness compelled M. Poincaré to resign. The cabinet remained the same, only its leader changing. M. Briand became Prime Minister while retaining his post as Minister of Foreign Affairs.

At the end of last October when Parliament opened its autumn session, the Ministry seemed somewhat weakened by the fact that certain members of the right wing of its majority were critical of its foreign policy and were particularly dissatisfied with M. Briand's attitude in the month of August at the Hague Conference. It was not believed that the Government was in any immediate danger, and yet to the general surprise it was defeated on October 22 by only eleven votes.

The proceedings of that day were extremely curious. M. Briand would not agree at once to a debate on foreign policy and the Radical-Socialists and Socialists then voted against the Government. If it was beaten, its defeat was due to the fact that some fifty deputies on the majority side joined with the opposition left because they were not satisfied with the explanations then given of the terms the Government had accepted at the Hague Conference in the matter of the evacuation of the third zone of the Rhineland. On the morrow of the Government defeat the situation was extremely obscure

and complicated. The Socialists and Radical Socialists approved of the foreign policy of M. Briand but condemned the domestic policy of his cabinet, while the fifty moderate deputies, whose votes had as a matter of fact produced the crisis, were satisfied with his internal policy but protested against certain details of his foreign policy.

M. Doumergue, the President of the Republic, first charged M. Daladier with the task of forming a ministry, he being the leader of the most numerous group—the Radical Socialists—of those who had turned out the Briand Government. M. Daladier, who is a supporter of an alliance between Radicals and Socialists, proposed to the latter that they should form a joint ministry with his party. After all manner of hesitation the Socialists definitely refused to share in the government, postponing the question to a congress which will be held at the end of the year. A government in which they took part, however, would not have lasted long in the present House, which is divided enough, but certainly possesses an anti-socialist majority. M. Daladier then tried to form a ministry in conjunction with the centre groups, but was not able to do so. A former Radical minister and Senator, M. Clementel, made a similar attempt without any better success. M. Doumergue finally appealed to a moderate Republican, M. André Tardieu, Minister of the Interior in the two previous cabinets, who within forty-eight hours was able to form a government.

The Tardieu ministry, when it appeared before the House on the 8th of November, secured a majority of 79 votes. It will carry on a domestic policy similar to that of the Poincaré and Briand governments and like them will be supported by right and centre groups. Its foreign policy will not be noticeably different to theirs, since M. Briand remains Minister of Foreign Affairs. It is noteworthy that in all the ministerial combinations which were contemplated, the Foreign Office was

always assigned to M. Briand, as no prime minister thought that he could yet do without his services. The fact of M. Tardieu being Prime Minister will perhaps bring it about that this foreign policy will be somewhat stronger than before. This new government, one may say, has in reality two heads—M. Tardieu and M. Briand. As long as the two agree it will have a good chance of remaining in power. It would be in danger only, if they should cease to be altogether in agreement, whether in public or privately.

The home policy of the Tardieu Cabinet envisages particularly certain points of a practical nature which are meant to assure the economic welfare of the country. With that in view, while maintaining an absolutely balanced budget, it means to devote some thousand millions of francs to public works (harbour developments, remaking of roads, extension of electrical facilities into country districts, building schools, reforestation, water power, anti-tuberculosis measures by means of sanatoria and hospitals, etc. etc.). The carrying out of this huge programme of constructive work is possible owing to the wise financial policy of the last three years, which enabled the Treasury, while beginning to fund its debt, to accumulate a reserve of more than 20 milliards¹ of francs. On the other hand, some diminution of taxation will be granted to French taxpayers, who, contrary to the legend spread in many countries, are among the most heavily taxed people in the world. This has been the case since 1926 when M. Poincaré to overcome the monetary crisis and to stabilize the franc caused to be passed through parliament a series of heavy taxes, which were piled on top of the substantial burdens which were already imposed. Still the government may have some difficulty with the Social Insurance Law—for old age pensions, sick pay, invalid maintenance—which is to come into force in February, 1930. This law, which was passed hastily and without a suffi-

¹A milliard is one thousand million.

cient examination of the question, will impose on the country at one stroke an annual charge of more than ten milliards of francs. A considerable fraction of public opinion demands the postponement and modification of its application. But both the Socialists and the trades unionists insist that a complete application of the law shall be made on the date already fixed. This is a considerable embarrassment to the present government.

The very practical programme I have outlined is meant to appeal to the popular majority. In other respects the ministry will pursue a moderate liberal policy, which, if no serious tactical errors are made, will ensure it the sympathy and support of the great majority of the House. On attaining power it had against it the Communists (11), the Socialists (101), nearly all the Radical Socialists (115) and some thirty deputies scattered among different groups. The Communists, to whom it is definitely hostile, will naturally oppose it *the whole time*, as they would any other possible government. The Socialists will provide the same opposition which they do to any government not drawn from the left of the chamber. It is less easy to predict the attitude of the Radical-Socialists, for they are a party much more mixed and their attitude has frequently changed. Probably the majority of them, following the orders of M. Daladier, will continue to oppose the government, for their policy is rather that of an alliance with the Socialists, though a certain number of them may move nearer to the majority position. But all this turns largely on points about which one can make no definite assertions. It must not be forgotten that owing to the want of party organization French Parliamentary life is liable to very sudden upsets, and surprises are always possible in the House itself. The Senate, on the other hand, whose members are elected for nine years not directly but by departmental assemblies and by delegates of the municipalities, is much more stable and is in fact the

preponderating element in French political organization. If, however, one cannot altogether eliminate the possibility of the unexpected happening and suddenly modifying the situation, it may be said that the Tardieu Cabinet seems to have some chance of lasting provided—as already stated—its leader, M. Tardieu, and its Foreign Minister, M. Briand, remain in entire agreement. This agreement between the two principal members of the government is all the more necessary because in the coming months foreign affairs will be the main business of the ministry and if it is not united will also produce the greatest difficulties.

We must now explain as clearly as possible the chief problems of foreign policy, and first of all those which concern, on the one hand, the application of the Young plan and the evacuation of the Rhineland and, on the other, the naval question. At the Hague conference in the month of August last, after a series of discussions sometimes baffling to a degree, an understanding was at last reached regarding the actual application of the Young plan and the conditions of the evacuation of the Rhineland. With regard to the Young plan, while certain essential points have been settled, a number of details had to be postponed; time had to be left to the technical committees to undertake and complete their tasks, especially the one charged with drawing up the statutes of the International Bank of Payments. The majority of these have by now completed their work. The statutes of the International Bank, the actual instrument of the Young plan, have now been settled. It is to be located at Basle. As so far all that has been done is to make certain proposals to the various governments, who have the right to suggest amendments, a second Hague conference must necessarily take place, but there is every reason to believe that it will end in a definite common agreement. The French government will have no trouble in obtaining the ratification by Parliament of all these

financial arrangements, for if they have been in certain quarters the object of some criticism, nobody thinks seriously of rejecting them. Practically everybody in fact realizes that at present the application of the Young plan is the best possible solution of this question and that it would be fatuous to oppose any obstacle to it.

The question of the evacuation of the Rhineland may possibly occasion more difficulty. It concerns the evacuation of the third and last zone (Mayence) which the Versailles Treaty anticipated being maintained until 1935: the first or Cologne zone was evacuated some years ago and the second or Coblenz zone has just been given up. The Formula adopted at the Hague in defining the conditions under which this third zone would be evacuated is a little obscure, for it begins by saying that the evacuation can take place only when the Young plan has actually been put into operation, while in another place it adds that it must be terminated by the thirtieth of June. It was this ambiguity which provoked an animated discussion in France with requests for an explanation by M. Briand and the surprise vote, which on the 22nd of October last brought about the defeat of his government. Among parliamentary groups of the Right the statement was made that evacuation should take place only when the mobilization of the German debt should have actually started, that is to say when the first slice of the bonds the Reich must hand over to the International Bank should have been actually deposited, and M. Briand was invited to explain how, if that were so, the precise date of June 30 could have been already so definitely fixed. As M. Briand would not answer this question, he lost fifty of the Right votes, which at once put him in a minority.

The matter has been somewhat cleared up since the constitution of the Briand-Tardieu ministry. The Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs have made their explanations, and their speeches have shown that what will happen

is as follows: the evacuation will be effected when the Hague agreements have been ratified by all the parties interested, and when, moreover, Germany has deposited in the coffers of the International Bank the bonds which are to be *put on the market*; but the purchase of these by private concerns will not be waited for, as Germany is in no way responsible for this operation. Evidently if Germany delayed too long in doing its part the date fixed (June 30) would be set back. But it is anticipated that the necessary dispositions will be made soon enough for the withdrawal of the troops to be completed on the appointed day, so that from July 1st there will be no allied soldiers left in the Rhine Provinces of the Reich.

Another matter of first class importance is under discussion between France and Germany. In August last at the Hague M. Briand and the late Dr. Stresemann exchanged letters in which they put on record their agreement with regard to the opening of negotiations to settle the question of the Saar valley. Negotiations duly began at the end of November in Paris. We must recall the situation in the Saar area, as it is defined by Articles 45 et. seq. of the Versailles Treaty. This area, which for fifteen years is still in the control of the League of Nations, is administered by a government commission of five members. The absolute ownership of the mines has been made over to France in compensation for the damage done to the French mines of the north. In 1935 the population has to pronounce on its future lot and say whether it prefers the maintenance of the existing régime, union with France or union with Germany. In the case of the whole or a part of the territory returning to Germany, the mines must be repurchased by that country at a fixed price in gold. Until 1935 the Saar area is under control of the French Customs.

In an ordinary way the consideration of the final status of the Saar should have been postponed until the end of the fifteen years fixed by the Versailles Treaty. As French com-

merce and industry had important interests in the district, that country had serious grounds for not seeking to hasten a solution. Germany might also have similar reasons since evidently she will have to pay France, in some form or another, compensation for the anticipated settlement. Both sides, however, have come to the conclusion that an immediate understanding, if in any way feasible, would have the best effect on the relations between the two countries. This doubtless is true, provided that the agreement to be made is really a satisfactory one. Beyond this there have been special reasons inclining both France and Germany not to wait for the results of the 1935 plebiscite. There is no doubt that the majority of the population, which is profoundly German in feeling, will declare itself in 1935 for a return to the Reich. France may have some interest then in anticipating this date in exchange for certain solid economic advantages. On the other hand, the vote will be by parish and by district (Paragraph 34 of the Annexe to articles 45-50 of the Versailles Treaty on the same question). But Germany is afraid that a certain number of parishes, bordering on French territory, may vote for France and may consequently be assigned to that country. She too has a special reason then for not letting matters drag out too long.

It is of course the League of Nations, described by the Treaty as the Trustee of the Saar area, which alone can officially and finally decide this matter of régime; but naturally, if France and Germany succeed in coming to a private understanding, the League will make no difficulty about endorsing their agreement. Here we would but briefly indicate the French viewpoint at the outset of the negotiations.

The first question is that of the mines. France, their lawful owner, can not give them up unless a fair price is offered by Germany. The first difficulty is to estimate the value of this huge reserve of coal. Some years ago the government of the Reich fixed its value pretty high, because the higher

it was estimated the greater the reduction in the amount of the reparations they had to pay. To-day German interests run in an opposite direction, and Germany in seeking to reduce the amount is naturally somewhat hampered by her previous figures. Besides this, arrangements have to be made for the future development of the mines as much in the interest of the population of the Saar area as in that of France. If the latter has need of a certain amount of coal, particularly for its industries in Lorraine, the people of the Saar, whose prosperity is identified with the mines, would suffer considerably if they were not certain of finding a ready market in France, for they would never succeed in disposing of their coal in Germany, where the mines of the Ruhr would be formidable competitors.

No less delicate is the question of the future Economic and Customs control of the Saar. French industries possess important interests in this territory and France cannot agree to let them suffer. The French commercial world has also built up an extensive clientèle in the Saar, and in spite of the limited area involved, it sells here almost as much merchandise as it does in Italy. The first concern is to devise a system which will not compromise this existing state of affairs.

In defending its own economic interests, France is at the same time defending those of the people of the Saar. The latter, as has been pointed out by all those who have given close study to the matter, are not able to secure adequate agricultural supplies anywhere else than in the neighbouring French departments of Alsace and Lorraine. The Lorraine iron ore is equally indispensable to them. Moreover, as we have already shown, this district, whose industries would vanish if the mines were not profitably exploited, has necessarily to export to France a large part of its coal. Now France would obviously make arrangements to do without this coal, if its own industrial and commercial interests were not

reciprocally looked after. The majority of the people of the Saar certainly desire, both on political and sentimental grounds, again to form part of the Reich. But the present order of things has yielded them a wide economic prosperity and they would speedily display some resentment if the German government should compromise this prosperity by failing to take adequate measures for its continuance.

Outside what are more distinctly Franco-German questions which we have just discussed, the question of naval armaments is the most important of those which concern the present French government. In the discussion which will take place at the end of January at the London Conference between the five chief maritime powers (Great Britain, the United States, Japan, France and Italy) the position of France will have to be defined as clearly and as concisely as can be for it is not always quite understood abroad. At the Washington conference in 1921-2 France accepted for "capital ships" a proportion which has generally been considered in French circles as by no means fair (5.25 for the United States and Great Britain, 3.75 for Japan, 1.75 for France and Italy). France agreed to this, however, because for reasons primarily financial she had no intention for some time to come of building battle-ships. But at that time she entirely reserved full liberty for other classes of craft—cruisers, destroyers, submarines. The impression prevails here that both the United States and Great Britain wish to establish the same proportion for the other classes of vessels as for capital ships, which, however, France can in no wise accept.

As France was not able to build ships during the war and the years immediately following as did Great Britain and the United States, she has been obliged to rebuild since then her fleet which was both weakened and obsolete. This reconstruction has been going on successfully for the last six or seven years, but is far from being complete. There seems to be a

tendency both at Washington and in London more or less to stereotype the present position of the different fleets. That, however, can never be accepted in France, the situation being due to temporary conditions which have still to be modified. The two powers mentioned would also seem to be desirous of obtaining the condemnation of the submarine. This again France cannot accept as submarines are indispensable to her to defend her extensive coast line and to assure her communications with Northern Africa. By means of their capital ships, Britain and the United States control the high seas. The other powers should at least have the means of protecting their shores against every eventuality otherwise they would be subject to a real hegemony of the Masters of the High Seas. As far as France is especially concerned, it is felt that a country whose continental territories are bathed by four seas—the Channel, the North Sea, the Atlantic, the Mediterranean—and which has also the largest colonial empire after Great Britain, both must and ought to maintain a naval force sufficient, in the event of any crisis, to enable her to provide protection for the territories under her flag. History teaches us that every country, which has no longer the means of itself defending its possessions, will inevitably lose them. No nation ought to put into another's hands the defence of its own vital interests: that is the lesson which experience has taught us. As was clearly stated by General Dawes, the American Ambassador to Great Britain, in a speech made on the 15th of November last, both America and Great Britain in the agreement they have made preliminary to the Naval Conference, have both of them provided for their own safety. France wishes to do the same and that is why she will not admit for cruisers or smaller vessels what is considered to be an absurd ratio for a country with four littorals to defend and one of the greatest colonial empires in the world. If she agreed to be put in this subordinate and dangerous position, far from

contributing to a general stability, she would only render peace more precarious. Any agreement on limitation of naval armaments which is not founded on justice and the real needs of the participating countries will do far more harm than good. That is French opinion on the matter and we believe it to be a useful thing to state it quite frankly.

If in certain respects French naval policy is not in complete accord with the ideas which seem to prevail at Washington or in London it is on the other hand in opposition to Italy with regard to a very important question. In 1921 at the Washington Conference, M. Briand, then as now foreign minister, accepted the same tonnage of capital ships for France as was assigned to Italy because he thought that it was of no great importance, as the French government had no intention at the moment of building capital ships. To-day Italy would like to have the same equality for all classes of ships. France cannot consent to this for the very simple reason that this apparent parity would in fact give Italy a considerable superiority.

The littoral of Italy is as a matter of fact altogether in the Mediterranean, of which the Adriatic is only a deep gulf, and she has no scattered colonies to protect. This is why she can concentrate all her naval forces. France, on the other hand, is obliged to concern herself not only with her Mediterranean coast but also with those of the North Sea, the Channel and the Atlantic. In addition to this she must make certain of the freedom of her communications with her principal colonies at all times but particularly in case of war. She needs particularly to make certain that there can be no severing of her maritime relations with that New France in Northern Africa formed by Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco. Consequently if a parity of tonnage were established between the French and Italian fleets the former being necessarily scattered could not

fight on even terms with the latter, which could then concentrate on cutting the communications with Northern Africa.

No one can ignore the fact that Italy casts its eyes sometimes with a certain jealousy on those North African countries which French effort has transformed and enriched. If France had in the future a navy inferior to Italy's (which would really be the case if a fictitious equality were established for the fleets of the two countries) an irresistible current might draw Italy some day into an adventure—and the present Italian régime be it remembered is founded on force and perpetually needs to maintain its prestige. Perhaps in America where the situation is so different there may be some difficulty in understanding the state of affairs which exists in Europe, where peace needs to have other guarantees than texts. This state of affairs none the less exists.

It is for the same reasons that the doctrine of the freedom of the seas, as it is understood in the United States, is subject to considerable reservations in France. We might be prepared to accept it if all the powers who had signed the Kellogg pact mutually undertook solemnly and formally to intervene with all their strength on behalf of a power attacked, and to take measures against a country committing an act of aggression. But the States have always refused to bind themselves in this fashion or to contemplate 'sanctions' in the case of a violation of the Pact of Paris. This example shows how false and dangerous a merely arithmetical calculation is in so complex a question as this. If due account is not taken of the defensive requirements of each country, both real and relative, the supposed equality may mean an absolute inferiority for the other. Life is more complicated and more varied than the mathematical formula to which it is sought to confine it.

A French government which surrendered in so vital a matter as this would very speedily be condemned and discarded by public opinion. Moreover, here again if France agreed to

this deceptive equality with Italy, she would not thereby serve the cause of peace. One must be very blind or very innocent if one imagines that international cupidity no longer exists. Individuals and corporations are as greedy as they were in the past. It is dangerous to tempt anyone by a display of weakness and a kind of abdication of one's position. Such being the case it seems to French people that a country which is attacked must maintain full right to hinder as much as possible its enemy's means of feeding itself. On the other hand, the League of Nations requires all its members to interrupt all commercial relations between a guilty country and the outside world, and this indeed is the best means, perhaps the only one available, to keep in the right way countries which might be tempted to attack their neighbours.

The freedom of the seas, that is to say the right of neutrals to trade with any type of belligerent and therefore to revictual a guilty one, while at the same time forbidding even an innocent belligerent preventing such a traffic might indeed be highly profitable to the most conscienceless of people, as long as countries had not undertaken to render one another mutual support in case of aggression. Such is in general the opinion which prevails here on this question. Doubtless the freedom of the seas will not be on the programme of the London Naval Conference. But the speech which President Hoover made on November 11 indicates that the United States in the near future mean to bring up this very difficult question, and even if nothing is said about it, it will still be constantly in the thoughts of the delegates who are meeting next January to discuss the limitation of naval armaments.

We will now complete this brief and rapid review of the French political situation. It has no pretensions to be absolutely exhaustive, but nothing has been omitted which is essential to an explanation of the outline of the situation. In foreign affairs the French attitude will probably not be modified to

any considerable extent, unless the Socialists come into power: even then there would not be so radical a change as one might expect, for this attitude more or less corresponds to the vital needs of the country and any party neglecting these interests would only be inviting a swift defeat. As we have defined it the external policy of the country has as its chief aim the maintenance of peace and stability generally, while neglecting no precautions which will be a check to any new troubles. It seeks to develop friendly relations with all peoples without losing sight of the fact that precautions are still needful to ensure world peace against any contingent dangers.

Internally the situation is still somewhat fluid. There is no majority strong enough for one to be able to forecast the situation for any length of time. All one can say is that the Tardieu cabinet seems to correspond pretty well, both in its composition and its policy, with the ideas prevailing in the present Chamber, whose mandate runs until 1932. But in a House which includes so many political groups, some of them very uncertain, unexpected movements are always possible, so that no definite prophecy can be made here.

At any rate it can be asserted that the country has extricated itself with credit from the great monetary crisis of 1924-5; the franc is now stable, the country's finances are in order, its budget is balanced, the funding of its debts has been arranged in a regular manner. If there is a shadow in the picture it is due to the excess of fiscal charges. Economic prosperity has not yet been seriously disturbed but the figures of external trade show that it is slowing down owing to the huge load of taxation of all kinds, which the French people have to bear. The time seems ripe for some relief to be offered in this quarter, for a burden of taxation made too excessive would expose the country to an economic crisis which would then induce a financial crisis. Such a danger is still remote, but to avoid it precautions must be taken in time.

THE FOUNDING OF EDMONTON

BY THE HON. FRANK OLIVER

THERE does not seem to be any definite record of the original locating and naming of Edmonton. There is a tradition that about 1793 a trading post was built within the site of the present city by a Hudson's Bay Company officer named Sutherland assisted by a clerk named Pruden, and that the latter gave it the name of his home town in England, the suburb of London made historic by association with John Gilpin's famous ride. There are many branches of the Pruden family resident on the prairies, and possibly some of them may have a more authentic record. The North West Company already had a post named Fort Augustus nearly opposite the present Fort Saskatchewan, but built a new Fort Augustus at Edmonton in 1798, doubtless to be near their competitors, the Hudson's Bay Company and the X. Y. Company. The older post was then abandoned. During the 1790's the headquarters posts of the Saskatchewan district, both for the North West and Hudson's Bay Companies, were some 200 miles eastward and down stream from Edmonton. Edmonton and Augustus were therefore regarded only as unimportant outposts, and as not likely to be permanent. This may account for the lack of authentic record of the founding of Edmonton.

There are reasons which lead fairly to the supposition that the X. Y. Company, which was then a new and aggressive competitor in the fur trade, was the first to select what is now Edmonton as a site for a trading post. The Hudson's Bay and North West Companies reached the Athabasca, Peace, and MacKenzie river region, their most valuable fur country, by the Long Portage canoe route which left the

Saskatchewan at Cumberland House west of The Pas and reached the Churchill by way of Amisk Lake at Frog portage, a comparatively short distance above the site of the Island Falls' power development now in progress, and the Athabasca at McMurray three hundred miles north of Edmonton. The twelve-mile portage from the waters of the Churchill to those of the Athabasca gave its name to the route, and was a word of dread to the voyageurs of those days. Besides its length there was a difference in elevation of a thousand feet between the north and south ends of the portage. All loads of goods or furs either going or coming were carried across on men's backs. In those good old days man power was the cheapest thing there was.

The X. Y. Company came into existence some time after 1790 and was merged with the North West Company in 1804. During its brief career it struck out on many new lines; its goods reached the Athabasca and other northern waters by a pack horse portage of 60 miles from the Saskatchewan to the Pembina, thereby avoiding the Long Portage. A slight rapid which occurs in the Saskatchewan River at the site of the present high level bridge was likely a deciding factor in the location of the X. Y. post at Edmonton. This rapid made the river fordable at this point more frequently than elsewhere for a long distance above or below, and thereby gave better access to the buffalo plains to the south from the more wooded country on the north side. As the base of supply for the Athabasca and the far north the X. Y. post was no doubt a headquarters post while those of the Hudson's Bay and North West Companies were only outposts. After the X. Y. Company had been absorbed by the North West Company it became the duty of all concerned to forget that there had been such a company as the X. Y. For that reason the records of its operations are extremely scanty.

The location of the X. Y. post cannot now be determined,

but the original Hudson's Bay post was on the "lower flat," on the site at present occupied by the city power plant. Because of high water in the river flooding this site on one occasion the post was removed to higher ground on the bench below the site of the present legislative building. This was the fort that was standing until after 1885, but of which not a trace now remains. The North West post was situated on the "upper flat", now the civic golf course near the westerly line of the Hudson's Bay reserve. Grass-grown depressions marked the location of both the old riverside posts fifty years ago and their active existence was within the memory of residents then living.

The two leading spirits of the North West Company were Simon McTavish and Alexander MacKenzie. McTavish was one of the original partners; MacKenzie came in when a rival Montreal concern united with the Nor'Westers. McTavish was the embodiment of energy, a dominating but not always a pleasing personality, a great executive to whom the profits of the trade were the first and last consideration. Of equally tireless energy, MacKenzie was all that McTavish could be as a trader and executive; but, in addition, he possessed a most attractive personality and was by nature an explorer with visions of imperial scope. Exploration to him was a means, not an end; expansion of empire, through the expansion of the fur trade, was his ideal. He had expected that the operations of the North West Company would have been extended westward and northward following his expeditions to the Arctic and the Pacific. But McTavish had different views; immediate profits plainly within reach interested him much more than proposals of expansion with possibly greater dividends in the more or less distant future. In 1799 MacKenzie left the North West Company and joined the X. Y. Company, a more recent and rival Montreal organization. Further expansion of Canadian trade towards the

Pacific was delayed until the death of McTavish in 1804 permitted the merging of the X. Y. and North West Companies with MacKenzie as the leading spirit of the reorganized concern.

The mouth of the Columbia on the Pacific had been the objective of MacKenzie's expedition in 1793. He had believed that the Fraser which he traversed for some distance was the Columbia, and it was not until Simon Fraser's expedition of 1808 that the error was discovered. In pursuance of the Company's revived policy of western expansion David Thompson, who had a distinguished record as trader, explorer, and geographer, in 1806 was placed in charge of Rocky Mountain House on the Saskatchewan about 150 miles above Edmonton. He made friends with the neighbouring Piegan Indians, selling them guns and ammunition amongst other articles of trade, and in 1807 discovered a practicable pass through the Rockies (since improperly named the Howse Pass) at the head of the Saskatchewan River, and established trading posts on the upper waters of the Columbia in what is now south-eastern British Columbia, in the western parts of the present states of Washington and Oregon, and in Northern Idaho.

About the same time Alexander Henry, the second of that name in the history of the North West Company and reputed to be an energetic and successful trader, was transferred from charge of the Red River district to that of the Saskatchewan, doubtless in furtherance of MacKenzie's westward looking policy. At that time the headquarters posts of both the North West and Hudson's Bay Companies for the Saskatchewan district were opposite the mouth of the South Vermillion River nearly 200 miles down stream from Edmonton. Henry took charge at Vermillion in 1808. By the winter of 1809-10 the trade to the upper Columbia had become stabilized with Rocky Mountain House as the permanent Saskatchewan river base.

Henry then decided that it would be in the interests of economy and efficiency for the North West Company to establish a new post at the mouth of the White Mud River about midway between Vermillion and Edmonton where the trade now going to these two posts could be concentrated, thus permitting both of them to be closed. This could be done only if the Hudson's Bay Company would agree to take the same action. The Hudson's Bay officer at Vermillion, Mr. Hallett, fell in with Henry's idea. Vermillion was abandoned at the end of May, 1810, and the work of erecting new buildings at White Mud was begun and completed during that summer by both companies. The North West Company's force that was removed from Vermillion to White Mud comprised 135 persons and the Hudson's Bay Company's 85.

The White Mud location had certain geographical advantages. It was at the most northerly bend of the Saskatchewan and was only 60 miles from Moose portage on the canoe route from the waters of the Athabasca at Lac la Biche to those of the Beaver, the south branch of the Churchill, a route that was followed by the fur traders to and from Lesser Slave Lake and the Upper Athabasca. This trade could be conveniently short-circuited by horse pack train in summer to the Saskatchewan at White Mud, giving that post command of the northerly route as well as of the Saskatchewan. From Henry's journal it appears that in the spring of 1811 Fort Augustus (and of course Edmonton) had been abandoned according to this plan. But already the unexpected had happened, upsetting all the careful calculations that would have wiped the name "Edmonton" from the map without leaving any authentic record of its existence or even a faded memory.

* * * * *

As the Indian lives by hunting, guns and ammunition are to him the most important articles of trade. The Blackfeet Indians occupied the part of the great plains watered by the

several branches of the South Saskatchewan River, which was also the most favoured range of the buffalo. The Piegan tribe of the Blackfeet nation occupied the region immediately east of the mountains, while to the west were the Kootenays. The wide grassy valleys and comparatively mild winters of the country of the Kootenays were particularly well adapted to the rearing of horses, but the buffalo did not range there. The Rockies are comparatively narrow in this part and there are several practicable passes. Having no buffalo and needing meat, the Kootenays from time to time made excursions into Piegan territory; the Piegans, who were always in need of more horses, made occasional visits to the land of the Kootenays to increase their means of rapid transport. Under the conditions of that day horse stealing and murder were recognized as the leading outdoor sports of the native races; by this method population was kept down to the level of the available means of subsistence according to Indian standards and ideals.

With the establishment of Rocky Mountain House the Piegans acquired guns in useful supply and visits to their Kootenay neighbours became more frequent and fruitful. Always on these occasions "a pleasant time was had" by the Piegans, and the number of Kootenay scalps adorning Piegan lodges was materially increased. But when Thompson pushed trade across the Rockies and sold guns and ammunition to the Kootenays the situation underwent a radical change. In July of 1810 the Kootenays felt sufficiently encouraged to undertake a buffalo hunt in force east of the Mountains. They were attacked by Piegans. The losses were seven Piegans killed and fourteen wounded: five Kootenays killed and nine wounded. So far as the battle itself was concerned it resulted in a draw; but it had surprisingly far-reaching consequences. The Piegans, of course, blamed everyone but themselves, including their friend Thompson who had sold guns to their enemies as well as to them. They did not revenge themselves

by sacking Rocky Mountain House because had they done so they would not have been able to secure a renewal of their stock of ammunition or further supplies of guns, and their position relative to the Kootenays would have been worse. But when Thompson, with canoes loaded with goods for the Kootenay trade, started up the river from Rocky Mountain House about September 20th, 1811, the Piegans served formal notice that he must not proceed. As owners of the territory through which his course lay they enforced an embargo against the passage of firearms or munitions to the Kootenays. The Piegans probably would have allowed Thompson to go through if he had left guns and ammunition out of his cargo; but, on the other hand, if he did not bring them the weapons they needed, the Kootenays would certainly be offended, and might show their resentment by drastic action.

The Nor'Westers were traders, not fighters. It was no part of their policy to quarrel with their customers, the Indians. But Thompson felt that as a partner of the North West Company it was his duty to get those goods to the Kootenays. By the time he had become convinced that the embargo was effective it had become too late to get his loads across the mountains that season by any route. But he did not accept defeat. He was informed by one of his Iroquois hunters of a more northerly pass which might be reached by following the Athabasca river through the easterly range of the Rockies and crossing the westerly range at the head of its upper waters. By withdrawing his horses from where they waited at the head of canoe navigation on the Saskatchewan and securing others in addition he collected a considerable pack train. The canoes were turned down stream and were unloaded some fifty or seventy-five miles below Mountain House where the river follows an almost northerly course before turning in the more easterly direction which it follows in passing Edmonton. The loads were taken from the canoes

to be packed on the horses and by the end of October, when winter usually commenced, the land journey to the Athabasca began. Thompson arrived at the Athabasca at or near the entrance to the eastern range of the mountains at the end of November, having passed through 150 miles of unmarked and very difficult wooded and muskeg country on the way.

It was impossible to use horses in winter in crossing the second range; the main part of the goods were therefore cached to await the spring when new grass would enable horses to be used to pack them to the Columbia. The goods, horses and a number of the men were left in charge of William Henry, cousin of Alexander, who established a post, afterwards known as Henry House, on an open grassy plain a few miles below the site of the present railway town and summer resort of Jasper. On January 5th Thompson went forward with an advance party of eight men and eight dog sleds, using two dogs to each sled; he crossed the divide by way of the Whirlpool pass (elevation over 6,000 feet), and reached the Big Bend of the Columbia on January 18th where he remained until the river opened in mid-April. During his stay at what was afterwards Boat Encampment on the Columbia three of his men deserted and one became ill and had to return to the Henry House. While waiting at the river he had built a canoe and on April 17th resumed his journey to the Kootenay country accompanied by a crew of three voyagers, "being the only men that had the courage to risk the chances of the voyage." He had lost the winter's trade, but he had discovered a practicable route across the mountains free from any possible interference by the Piegans and felt that he had scored a success.

The route explored by Thompson was followed by the North West and Hudson's Bay traders during the succeeding thirty years, and through the first range of mountains is now the route of the Canadian National Railway. While the actual

distance from Edmonton to the Big Bend was considerably greater than that from Rocky Mountain House to a point farther up the Columbia, there were some compensating advantages in the Jasper Pass route. From the Columbia at the Big Bend to the Henry House on the Athabasca the distance was less than 100 miles. From the Henry House the Athabasca gave excellent down stream navigation by raft or boat to Fort Assiniboine, some 90 miles by good pack trail from Edmonton. Eastbound traffic usually took that route. But the main advantage of the Edmonton route was that it was secure from any interference by hostile Indians of the plains whether they came from the South Saskatchewan or even from the more distant Missouri.

As a direct result of the battle between Piegans and Kootenays in July, 1810, and of Thompson's exploration of the Jasper and Whirlpool Passes, Edmonton and Augustus, instead of being forgotten as abandoned outposts, were both promptly reoccupied. As the most convenient river base of the new transcontinent route, they were made district headquarters by the respective companies, while White Mud post was forgotten and Rocky Mountain House became a mere secondary outpost. For the next thirty years the posts located on the site of the present Edmonton were the most important in the trade of what is now Western Canada.

The two rival trading companies were merged in 1821 under the name of the Hudson's Bay Company which exercised rights of government as well as of trade under imperial charter. The union involved a great reduction of working forces, which, indeed, was one of its main purposes; but a large proportion of the former employees of the North West Company remained in the West. As Montreal was the base of the company's operations its employees, drawn chiefly from Lower Canada, were largely of the French race and language. Those of the Red River district settled along the Red and Assiniboine

Rivers near Fort Garry and became the pioneers of agricultural settlement there; those of the Saskatchewan district settled at Lake St. Anne and Lac la Biche, respectively west and north of Edmonton. The abundance of whitefish in these lakes assured a basic food supply, while the proximity of buffalo on the southerly plains gave further promise of food, as well as of trade and sport. The wooded country north of the Saskatchewan River protected them from Blackfeet raids, an important consideration in those days. By intermarriage with the friendly Crees a self-dependent resident population of mixed blood became established which maintained friendly relations with the Hudson's Bay Company. The men were frequently employed by the Company for special work, and to distinguish them from the engaged servants of the Company they were spoken of as "Freemen."

As numbers increased in these native settlements fear of the Blackfeet decreased. For greater convenience in reaching the buffalo plains, at a later date the St. Albert settlement was formed in a picturesque situation on the banks of the Sturgeon River and Big Lake, nine miles north-west of Edmonton. The Oblate order of the Roman Catholic Church established a mission there that in course of time became the head of the diocese of St. Albert, which included the area now covered by the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. Most of the people of these settlements spoke French and Cree, although some spoke English.

Among the employees of the North West Company were a number of Iroquois Indians from the settlements near Montreal, expert canoe men and fur hunters whose services seem to have been valued highly by the North West Company. After the merger a number of these Iroquois banded together and established themselves in and about the Jasper Pass where they followed a policy of peaceful penetration rather than of warlike activity in regard to the Mountain Stoneys whose

country naturally included the Rocky Mountains. Although these Iroquois and their descendants have intermarried with both Crees and Stonies since that time, they still retain their Iroquois names and racial pride. When that area was included in the National Park they removed from Jasper Pass and are now settled at Grand Cache on the Smoky River about 80 miles north-west of Entrance Station on the National Railway.

* * * * *

With the formal cession of the Oregon territory (the region of the Columbia) to the United States in 1846 and with the development of trade "around the Horn" to the North Pacific coast, Edmonton ceased to be the main transfer point on a great transcontinental trade route and became merely the chief post of the Hudson's Bay Company trading district of the Saskatchewan, as Fort Garry was the chief post of the district of Red River. The Saskatchewan district included the area covered by the present provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, while the Red River district included Manitoba, South-eastern Saskatchewan and Western Ontario. The affairs of each trade district were directed from its chief post which was the place of residence of the Chief Factor.

So long as communication was maintained with London through Hudson Bay by way of York Factory, Norway House, and the Saskatchewan River, Edmonton retained a large share of its earlier prestige. But a time came in the late 50's and early 60's when by reason of the north-westerly extension of railways St. Paul became the base of the Hudson's Bay supply instead of York Factory. Communication had been opened between the Red River settlement and St. Paul by means of pony and ox carts. Fort Garry took the place of Norway House, and distribution was made to posts throughout the plains by cart trail instead of by waterway. To avoid the Blackfeet country the cart trail from

Edmonton to Fort Garry followed the north bank of the Saskatchewan to Carlton Hudson's Bay post, a few miles north of Duck Lake station on the Prince Albert branch of the Canadian National Railways. The trail crossed the north branch at Carlton and passing Duck Lake crossed the south branch at Batoche and then struck south-easterly to Fort Garry. This change in the system of transportation was revolutionary; it made Edmonton a distant outpost instead of the important centre and distributing point that it had been for many years. Any point nearer Fort Garry had an advantage over Edmonton in that its trade goods cost less in freight and there was a shorter haul to market for its exports which consisted chiefly of buffalo robes. By reason of its more favourable situation Carlton threatened to acquire the prestige that had belonged to Edmonton.

Steamboat navigation up the Missouri from St. Louis made of Fort Benton in Montana an important base of trade. Outposts from Benton, in the district now Southern Alberta, supplied the Blackfeet more conveniently than Edmonton could and in the 60's drew away from the northern post a trade that had always been carried on under difficulties because the Blackfeet were on the ground of the hostile Crees when they visited Edmonton. Although the Hudson's Bay Company made every effort to keep the peace, that was not always possible, and in the palmy days there was a frequent recurrence of "regrettable incidents." The fact, moreover, that any one who owned a pony and cart could travel where and when he pleased throughout the plains, subject of course to limitations created by Blackfeet activities, permitted a freedom of intercourse that did not prevail when transportation was only by river. It also naturally permitted full liberty of trade, and in effect set aside the trade monopoly held during half a century by the Hudson's Bay Company.

The tide of progress seemed to have turned as definitely

against Edmonton in the early 60's as when it had been abandoned in 1809. Even some members of the adjacent native settlements moved eastward and settled at Duck Lake and on the south branch of the Saskatchewan, at the crossing of the Carlton-Fort Garry trail. Batoche, who gave his name to the crossing, and Dumont, who was military leader in the '85 rebellion, were both of families who had removed from the original native settlements near Edmonton; others scattered to various points of vantage with the result that the native settlements near Edmonton diminished rather than increased.

* * * * *

The California gold strike in 1849 started a movement that spread civilization throughout the great mountain region between the Rockies and the Pacific within two decades. Active, energetic, ambitious, often reckless men drawn from all walks of life prospected every stream in every valley in all the mountain region from the American border to Alaska. During the 50's California was the chief field of activity; during the 60's the gold seekers spread over British Columbia, Idaho and western Montana. Cariboo was the climax of the search, the richest diggings that had ever been worked in the world's history. When Cariboo had passed its peak of production the thousands of miners who had gathered there began to scatter far and wide in search of other fields. Although far from the mountains and entirely without geological warrant, gold was struck on the Saskatchewan in the later 60's. Tom Clover worked the discovery claim on a river bar some ten miles below Edmonton, where the Canadian National Railway bridge now spans the North Saskatchewan. His name was given to the bar on which he worked and afterwards to the adjacent agricultural settlement. There was a rush to the new diggings at Edmonton, and for several seasons over fifty miners worked on the gold-bearing stretch of the river which extended from a point 50 miles above to 50 miles below

Edmonton. An ounce of dust a day, worth \$16, was considered pay, but the working season was short—only during the period of low water in spring and fall. The field offered no chance of “making a killing,” which is the great objective of the miner. The richer bars were soon worked out and, as in the case of other placer diggings, when the peak was passed the miners began to drift away to other fields. But some who by that time had had enough of the excitements and chances of the miner’s life were attracted by the excellent possibilities and the advantages of residence in that region and remained as pioneer farmers along with others who depended solely on gold mining for their living. A considerable amount of gold was taken from the river each year until after 1890 and a small amount of platinum was also found in conjunction with the gold.

The importance of the gold rush to Edmonton was not in the amount of metal actually produced or in the numbers that were permanently added to the population, as much as in the fact that it brought in a distinctive and entirely modern element, with a background and outlook radically different from that of any other of the original settlements in the Canadian West. The influence of the small community of the men from “across the Mountains,” was altogether out of proportion to their numbers. They had become anchored at Edmonton and by reason of their occupation, associations and force of character were a strong influence in anchoring Edmonton, at a time when its prestige was rapidly diminishing if not altogether passing.

* * * * *

The Hudson’s Bay Company drew its employees chiefly from the Orkney Islands and the Hebrides. The agreements under which the men enlisted provided that they must be returned to their homes overseas at the end of their period of service if they so desired; while many availed themselves of

this provision there were some, chiefly those who had married during their term of employment, who preferred to remain in the country. Most of these men found conditions congenial in the Red River settlements and made their homes there; but in the Edmonton district there were a few whom the Red River did not attract and who had scattered about in the surrounding country. In the Red River settlements there was a recognition of individual land tenure, but this system did not extend to the Saskatchewan where individual rights to land were held merely by common consent. This condition naturally tended seriously against permanent settlement.

In 1869 the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company to "Rupert's Land" were transferred to the Dominion of Canada and by the agreement of transfer the Hudson's Bay Company retained one thousand acres of land around each of their principal posts, including Edmonton. The rest of the country north of the North Saskatchewan became definitely the property of the Crown, that is of the people. The Hudson's Bay Company's reserve at Edmonton was surveyed in 1870; the area was about a mile from east to west with the post located on the river bank about midway between the boundaries. This survey gave a definite starting point at which private rights might begin. Rev. George McDougall, a native of Ontario, who had ministered to settlements at Sault Ste. Marie and Norway House, was in charge of the Methodist mission at Victoria (now Pakan), 80 miles down the river, where a settlement had been formed of English-speaking half-breeds who had migrated from Portage la Prairie some years before and who because of their situation enjoyed easy access to the buffalo plains. When the question of property rights had been settled, first by the transfer to Canada, and then by the Hudson's Bay Company's survey of their property, he decided that the time had come for the establishment of a mission at Edmonton which until then had no Protestant missionary.

In 1870 he staked two claims for the Methodist Missionary Society, the first adjoining the east line of the Hudson's Bay reserve and the second next adjoining it to the east. These claims overlooked the valley, about 200 feet above the river, and were most attractively situated. A series of nine claims were staked along the river bank easterly from the Hudson's Bay line and were taken by the Methodist Church, the Methodist Mission, David McDougall, Colin Fraser, John Sinclair, Donald McLeod, James Rowland, William Rowland, and Kenneth Macdonald. On the west side of the Reserve Malcolm Groat staked his claim. As there was no one between him and the Rocky Mountains he staked a mile square. These claims, with the Hudson's Bay Company's Reserve, occupy the area that about 1890 became incorporated as the town of Edmonton. The present city takes in a much larger area, but it may fairly be claimed that the staking of the claims mentioned was in effect the founding of the city. Of the claim holders Sinclair was an ex-officer of the Hudson's Bay Company; MacLeod and Macdonald were ex-employees from "The Lewes"; Groat, also an ex-employee, was from the main land of Scotland; Fraser and the Rowland brothers were sons of ex-officers of the Company; McDougall was a son of the missionary.

Well-built houses of hewn logs and having shingled roofs were erected on each claim, and land was brought under cultivation, giving an air of civilized occupation in striking contrast to that of most other early western settlements. All lumber was sawn and all shingles were made by hand. The church was built in 1871 entirely by voluntary labor; it was of logs, but sheeted inside and out with lumber sawn and dressed by hand.

When this settlement was made St. Paul, 450 miles south-west of Winnipeg, was the base of supply for Rupert's Land and railroad extension north-westward from St. Paul

had only begun. The mail packet from Winnipeg, 900 miles away, arrived twice during each winter by Hudson's Bay Company dog team. In summer there was no regular mail delivery; letters were carried by the kindness of travelling friends. There was of course no telegraph. Portage la Prairie, 60 miles from Winnipeg, was the nearest established settlement to the eastward. The Prince Albert Mission and settlement established in the late 60's was only 500 miles down the Saskatchewan, but it was not on the regular route of travel. Under such conditions the town of Edmonton, although its population was small in numbers and made up of various diverse elements, had prestige and importance as a centre and rallying point in the westward march of civilization that was of great value in the earlier years and that has been maintained ever since under all changes of circumstance.

The present Edmonton is ninth in population of the cities of the Dominion; a great railroad centre and the capital of the province as well as the seat of the Provincial University. It is fair to believe that when the Rev. George McDougall staked the mission claims he visioned in some degree the future greatness that would follow the efforts then being made. The present city may fairly be accepted as a monument to his enterprise, his judgment and his timely activity. Edmonton did not just happen. Things happen because some one makes them happen. Edmonton grew between 1793 and the present date because from time to time there were people who made it grow.

HIVERNANTS

BY EILEEN B. THOMPSON

TO go alone and be a novice in the manner of going makes one a pioneer in any land. We can sit behind a trained chauffeur for a hundred miles of never visited country and not find it so dangerously new as is the hill near the garden gate when climbed for the first time by our own effort. And for two beginners with a car to start for a seventy mile drive on the Ste. Agathe road is to lift that familiar highway into the dream-haunted domain of lands once seen in transit and remembered in desire forever.

Seen on an ordinary day with an ordinary practised driver that road is but a motor route that every migrant takes. The plains of Ile Jésus are a dull, dusty green broken by field-girt woods and two mild rivers. The squashed and domed mounds of Piedmont and the dips of Val Morin are cupped with hill charm always: blue far ridges stretch unendingly to the north. But foodstalls, tourist notices, gasoline stations, the ceaseless traffic of one car wriggling past another, worst of all the summer visitors perambulating the village streets are forever lying between the road and the opening Laurentian hills.

On a Monday morning, very early, as September is dropping from its summit into October, when schools have brought parents back into the city, and every business man is properly at work, when even Ahuntsic has returned to its own French country and is no longer a suburb of the boulevards, it is a very different road. France could not be more foreign than was the other side of Rivière des Prairies when we left the bridge behind. The plains had lost their even tone, they were humped and hillocked with colour and cloud. Stripped fields had become as gleaming yellow wax, woods grown into great

clusters of zinnias held high against the sky. Wicked ditches ran cluttered with purple and crimson as if their briars had been dyed in some deep underneath vat. How could there be monotony when each crossing, each turn squared round a blind stone wall, held a hazard and every chicken was a beast of wildest impulse? White, solemn houses stood at dangerous curves, and we had almost to stop before we dared look at the boughs of flamboyant maples flagged above them, or the elm trees dribbling gold. And reaching into the gorgeous distance the thin far highway became a tape for us to pull in, knot by knot, twist by twist, till we too could be drawn up into the unbelievable hills beyond.

There could be nowhere greater beauty than was on these first ridges of the Laurentians that clear autumn morning. Keen and warm and still the air, utterly devoid of film or mist. No clouded deepening of the valleys, no obscure magic in the distance, simply colour piled on colour, on every slope, by every curve, round every lake, colour of fire, of wine, of fruits, great solid masses of it, crimson darkening to purple, paling to cream, balls of green and yellow willows, the ground a spatter of gold and red. No simile was useful. Apples and pomegranates, persimmons and passion fruit . . . their bodies were too heavy for these thin crisp leaves suspended in the sun, even the thickest patches had the lightness of burning wood. Claret and burgundy, yellow and green chartreuse, names too liquid and sensuous, though their colours were poured over the hill tops and were cascading down the valleys! Flower terms were better, asters and straw flowers or those garden everlasting that take on all the bye-tints of foliage, for the maple clumps were veritable bouquets, strays from gigantic beds that extended into the horizon on the right and the left of the road. But only for the first miles were such thoughts good, the miles of more cultivated fields and summer cottages. Further the lakes and forests would hold no association with garden or

vineyard, they were a flame and glory unto themselves and the sparse farms in their midst.

Every traveller has his own cells of loveliness, places he would share with none, intimate to his own desires. But this was a spectacle for the whole world. Calling for a pilgrimage! The Japanese make an annual festival for the blossoming cherry; how would they or the dwellers of Greece act before this northern splendour of a forest dying in pageantry, summer burning its way to Valhalla with flames of the aurora on its multitudinous torches of trees?

St. Jerome, Ste. Margarete, Ste. Adèle, those spoiled little villages of the summer season, were now quiet in their own concerns. The food stalls were closed, many of the notices down or in some way less blatant. In truth the blind traffic of the tourist affects their main streets only. Behind them the old, continuous life of the land goes on, unaltered, untouched. that anciently innocent life of Quebec, so jealously guarded by its Church. That morning St. Jerome felt unbrokenly Catholic, the gray buildings of the convents and church looked strong and sequestered behind the pagan riot of the leaves; above the gay muck of those fallen the poplars were smooth and serious as the papal guard. A grave beauty lay on it but we could not play with autumn till we were free on the hills.

A trip that has no accident never brings favour out of a country: it skims on its surface, asking neither for its resources or skill. So to be ditched slightly, without injury, away from the main road and its garages, is a gift from the watching gods. That is if it be at noon under a hot sky and a rowan tree, by a high rock where one can sit and split the dying fireweed's secret and idly see it open from a mauve pink sheath, thin as a dragon fly, to a fan of cobweb milkweed beauty.

Waiting, a horse must come. So we waited till one man

passed and told another and slowly a farmer fetched his team and wire from a fence and pulled the silly, helpless motor back upon the road. And receiving good money made no comment on the primal impotence of machines. But for the minute we felt it, and our helplessness made the country seem very far and brought it very near.

On a hillock never seen in summer, part always of baked fields and hot uncovered stretches, we had lunch; on a mat of wine dark pigeon berries, close in warp, islanded by pale tan fields sliding under us to a tiny stream which ran below a bank of feathery tamaracks. Some clouds had come up to patch the sunlight and deepen the hollows in which three or four white farm houses had been dropped: one of them, very tiny and bright French Canadian pink had an old line of roof to its root house. About them were the hills of painted woods. To the top of one summit stretched a swathe of still green poplars like a long arm of summer through the scarlet and gold. Facing us was a cliff of marble mottle where the ashes made delicate mauve and green veins through the fiercer reds of the maples and in some spots quartz of deep cream shading into rose. Here and there a spruce stuck up, a spire of cold and vivid blue. And yet, though the valley swarmed with colour and its fire tipped the highest ranges, the earth was not tapestried with it as it can be in summer with flowers. The frame showed through. On the heights where the winds had thinned the leaves the rocks were violently gray, shields of granite hung high and enduring above the pageant flames. Through a glow we could see the naked structure of mountain and slope.

We left the motor in a field and went to a camp through a trail in the woods.

To come on an accustomed place at an unaccustomed time is to find it for the first time over again. To a camp, especially. For if a man has, not a gardened house, but a real

camp where he lives in the woods and does not claim them for pasture and alien flowers, when he leaves it the woods take it back. He never truly owns his land, he asks for it every year. So when we opened our shack that afternoon, hearing the unhuman hush of the forest, seeing the unsought sun emptying his warmth into the stillness of a closed room, we stepped softly, for we were breaking into what was really not ours. If it had been a country of fairies we had said a rune or searched for a bowl of milk, but the Indian spirits have vanished or are unfelt by our modern race. The Catholic Church exorcised them long ago and gave instead demons of its own. Both may still shadow the farther wilds. But here were only the feet of squirrel and hare, the late talk of chickadee and a loon on a lake close by. And when we piled a log of yellow birch upon a balsam we lit them simply for their warmth and comfort and for their smell—the smell and crackle of the woods, far off, pure from all association, free from all imported thought.

No house could keep us. From the little lake in front of the camp came the call of all the northern lakes, seen and unseen, which had risen in us from the smoke of our fire. A queer little lake. Its shores were not so flaringly coloured as the hills around the farms, they had more the dusky shades of spices frothed with gold and sparsely by brilliant overhanging maple boughs. The water looked still and dark and hard, and when we took a canoe it seemed to splinter it like glass. Rocks and trees were not so much mirrored in it; they were underneath, so that we saw down into a crystal embedded forest: the broad, deep shaded flaps of the wayfaring bush and the shining purple and yellow discs of the tiny leafed shrubs were brittle and fragile ornaments in a black, glass-covered bowl. No bird sang. A loon swam near, and a crane rose from some reeds in noiseless flight.

Sometimes the northern year lets down a day, hangs it

between the seasons, a day that has no significance in the procession of the months. One that knows not growth nor decay. That neither by wind or rain nor seasonable sun moves toward either life or death. It may come, but seldom, in early spring before the ice breaks, when winter's glazed hand still holds the earth against the hot sun though his power has gone, when the whole surface of the world is caught up in an unbroken light. More often it is in autumn just when the leaves have attained their richest colouring and have not fallen, when summer is still in the warmth of the ground and the open glades but cannot make another bud nor blossom, when even the berries have gone. Frost is leashed in the shaded coverts. For a halcyon moment nothing happens, the season is poised in its flight. And from its wings drops this day which never sinks to become part of 'earth's diurnal course' but at sunset is lifted up and folded back into the flaming caverns of the sky.

We were paddling round the edge of such a day. Then a shot split the air, a random shot of a man lost in the bush, then cries, and finally the answering shouts of a comrade. The unreal isolation of the lake was broken. With the shot the sense of the woods, personal and savage and hunted, bore down on us. Dark tumbled quickly and we turned back for food and fire.

It may be the savage in us; some deem it the sentimentality of city men. For no woodsman or farmer feels what we know as a truth, that for those who are bred in the covered ease of automatic comfort to come, be it ever so little, in bare contact with the sources of life is to be cleansed and purged. Not for too long. We are pledged to civilization and do not wish to abandon its plumbing. But it is profoundly wonderful to be free from it, to scoop water from a living lake rather than from a tap, to feel heat not from an unseen generator but to see it rise from fire-lit bark and log and to know that when they are ashes we must go out into the woods for

more. We forget that we burn trees and drink the streams and can carry burdens on our backs. And those who to their camps import too many concealed mechanisms build a wall made of the city against this naked knowledge over which the feeling of the woods can hardly climb. It is the settler's duty to subdue and make defence against the wilds; to him the bucket becomes as habitual as the cistern. But we whom the early French called 'hivernants'—dwellers by winter in the cities—when we bring too much with us to the woods, lose that dependence on light and dark, shift of wind and shadow, the near obedience to the hours wherein lies the freedom for which we came.

So to feed off the country we visit is good. We cannot always, in the barren months of the north, but when we can our contact is deeper. Into the religionists who ate their god and their enemy, entered the strength of the eaten. We do not remember where we have not eaten (or been made love to), but if what we taste be the food or drink of the land or its people we shall never forget. The cherry and haw are summer and autumn as they drop from their branches into our mouths and ever after they give not only their individual acid sweet and amber marrow but the whole flavour of steel gray rocks rising hot above deep verdured woods, or the ragged crimson edges of fields shorn yellow to the sun. Is this sentimentality of cities again, of those born in the nature love of a past decade who will not face wholly either country or town and are open to to-day's quick scorn? Perhaps; yet one lack of this keen generation may be that it must feel all beauty instantaneously with its nerves and is losing the slow intake of it through the senses, by taste and smell and touch.

It was with utter unconsciousness that after the sudden dark had fallen we put aside the basket that we had brought from the city and turned to the eggs and cream of the farm. No service spoiled our solitude. The balm of the balsam was

beginning to make even the farmlands recede, and in shelter we sat silent on the edge of unblazed wilds and could hear the pant of them, nearer than any speech or dream.

Later on in the dark (it was very still and rather warm) we went down to the wharf to wash, and as we dipped our hands where a star ray had made a hole in the water the woods drew nearer and felt less trespassed on. Strange how an habitual act done in an unusual place makes that place part of us and we of it! In the bush especially. Perhaps because intent on our own doings we are unconscious like the animals and for the time make the woods our habitat.

The wild things know this instantly, feel themselves unwatched and come around; with them the forest breathes with us and our alienage slips away. And that hour as we leaned from the wharf over the black water the north dropped a tent over us; its tall pines became our totem poles.

A single night stolen from the city for quiet is too exciting for rest. The tide of the wilds sweeps strongly over the dykes of sleep and receding carries our flotsam spirits out into the dark, over lake and trail impassable by day to lands we cannot reach, of the Indian and rabbit skin and white men lost in the bush. So we lay quiveringly through that night till dawn brought us back, when we slept lazily and rose to light a fire and slept again. Then rose to a day of sheer autumn held by earth in utter breathlessness.

The shores of a lake in summer, the uplands in fall! Most of all the hardwood ridges where the partridge clucks and the squirrel mimics him and mocks the gun. The morning led us to a new trail, past the too green balsams (only in summer and winter do the coniferous trees waylay us), over tiny streams patched and hidden by vivid leaves, up to the smooth shining boles of the beeches, and high rocks like lost monoliths in a circus of poised and coloured darts. Even when the sun was hidden the light was warm yellow through

the gilded parchment of the foliage; we walked on crinkling red and gold and when we paused were imprisoned in a lacquer cage. Then we climbed the rocks and suddenly the tree tops were below us and small lakes shone on different sides like bits of mica in the dyed silks of Indian embroidery. But it was not the Orient we thought of; a spur of the great northern bush was there, under our feet, part of the unyielded and retreating wilds rolling to the unmapped plains, its covers shadowing a thousand restless feet of wolf and deer, its surface troubled by a vast expectant pomp. Nothing mattered, only that we were in the woods, that the sun on the rock where we sat was hot, the poignant marvel of the trees, the squirrels mid the beechnuts, that it was autumn and winter must come. For this day was not as the other, a hiatus and trance of the sky, but part of earth's season, radiantly and perceptibly pushing the year into change. A lithe wind was pricking the branches. In spite of the sun the warm sweat of the earth was rising and being carried off into hollows out of which a new coolness came which ran up and down the shaded side of rocks and larger trees. The heat of the rock and the warm glow of the woods was transient. Our bodies were hot; the distant water of the lakes tempted us and a desire to take off clothes.

Down through the noon-arched trail and brittle leaves we tumbled, back to the balsams and the laurel edges of the lake. In autumn a bathe is a sharp and stolen pleasure, thieved like our days from the city, and we faced it more for the moments after when the sun anoints the pricked and startled skin. So we bathed quickly and lay behind the alders, part of earth and air and water, beaten by the lashes of the sun and wrapped by the lazy humour of the trees. Till the wind shifted and blew a cloud across our backs and chased us into clothes. With our nakedness went our union with the untimed, molten noon: with clothes came hours and the speed of city minutes. The

forest circle had vanished; on the other side the trees the motor stood.

What we are leaving closes behind us when our thought goes. In a twinkling our watch had changed us to outsiders and we gazed at the gold-winged wood with eyes ahead. Laden, we took the trail hushed by chickadees and soon to be marked by deer; it had become a mere path in the woods. The farm lands were there.

Chortle of the starter and burr of the gears: the chain of the road in our hands! He who at the turn of the year and the droop of the day drives down from the Laurentians comes as a conqueror on to his own city, the excitement of the hills in his eyes. A motor is an arrogant chariot, claiming all the land it travels over. As we drove from the heights we carried the spoils of sunset like fire-coloured branches at our back and when we passed the French villages we gathered them too and the golden-cruised lakes. To the right and the left the low mountains folded and unfolded till they flattened into plains. And the *Rivière de Mille Iles* took the red day from the sky and sank it into its depths. The night lamps of motors stared, and from every road came other cars toward the webbed lights of the city. The noise of traffic began. It was familiar and we were at home.

For we are hibernants, dwellers in a city. But for our escape and for our salvation we go north.

IS "CIVILIZED WARFARE" POSSIBLE?

BY C. P. STACEY

ON Armistice Day the President of the United States expressed an opinion which received wide publicity, outside his own country as within it. As reported by *The New York Times*, his statement ran thus: "For many years, and born of a poignant personal experience, I have held that food ships should be made free of any interference in time of war. I would place all vessels laden solely with food supplies on the same footing as hospital ships. The time has come when we should remove starvation of women and children from the weapons of warfare."

A flood of comment followed. Praise of the *spirit* which underlay Mr. Hoover's remarks was practically universal; but editors, abroad at least, were not so unanimous in approbation of the practical value of his suggestions. The first English reaction was characterized by the watchful American press as signifying "qualified approval"; and French observers were inclined to be more directly critical. In particular, they pointed out that the new doctrine was directly opposed to the provisions of Article 16 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, which authorizes the peaceful coercion of recalcitrant nations by the League through the proclamation against them of an economic blockade. Jacques Bainville, writing in *La Liberté*, inquired "Will the pacific means provided by the Covenant to force a violator of the pact to his knees be abandoned?" Mr. Hoover's countrymen, always prone to applaud utterances based on moral idealism, particularly when they issue from an American President in the course of an admonition to the world at large, were kinder to his proposal; one distinguished Senator exclaimed, "One of the

great needs of modern times is to modify the cruel and brutal code of war on the sea," and another remarked somewhat expansively, "If in time of war the starvation of women and children could be eliminated, it would be a glorious consummation."

Thus there was raised once more a question over which much ink has been spilled and much breath expended before, during and since the Great War—that of the possibility of "civilizing" warfare; of confining Mars within metes and bounds drawn in accordance with the humanitarian instincts of cultivated mankind. The phrase "civilized war" is a great popular shibboleth. It was hurled by the Allies at the Germans in connection with their use of poison gas, and their principle of unrestricted submarine warfare against merchant vessels, the agreements of the Hague Convention being quoted as its embodiment. Since the peace it has found expression in the attempt to outlaw chemical warfare by a provision of the Washington Treaty, and in widespread discussion of the possibility, not merely of binding submarine operations by strict rules, but of the entire abolition of the submarine as a weapon of war. Mr. Hoover's recent pronouncement may be regarded as the finest flower of that school of thought which believes that war may be made "humane" by such international regulation before the fact.

That particular opinion has been so fortunate as practically to monopolize public attention. It appeals to the passively altruistic feelings of the man in the street, and so it makes acceptable grist for the mills of politicians and newspapers. It is thoroughly respectable in its associations; and its partisans, if their position is questioned, can and do hurl at the questioners' heads the whole armoury of epithet which is afforded them by the natural popular hatred of the vaguely defined notions comprehended in the public mind in such words as "Prussianism" or "Militarism." Nevertheless, the

contrary opinion continues to exist; and though, owing to the fact that it is held chiefly by professional experts, it has not been blessed with much publicity, the arguments advanced in its support have been such as to merit the consideration of students of affairs, and an examination of them is certainly calculated to create doubt as to the utility of such agreements as Mr. Hoover proposes.

British soldiers in the mass have as a rule given little thought to the theoretical basis of their profession, and British wars have too often been fought by rule of thumb; yet there has usually been in the Army at any given period a group of officers of a different temperament, inclined to regard the business of making war from a more philosophical point of view, and it cannot be doubted that this inquiring attitude has been more prevalent since the Great War than at any previous time. The foundations of the science of war have been examined anew, and the practice of 1914-1918 has been subjected to severe criticism; and the investigators have stated their conclusions with the candour born of experience of the unattractive realities of that struggle. The observations of these British students afford a firm basis for criticism of the notions of those who believe in the possibility of legislating the horrors out of war, and of those in particular who, like Mr. Hoover, think that by such means civilians may be spared injury and privation.

The kernel of the thought of this new school is to be found in its examination of the works of Clausewitz, the great German military philosopher, who died in 1831, and its revision of his doctrines in the light of modern experience and invention. In the opinion of Clausewitz, war was to be regarded simply as "a continuation of state policy by other means"; it belonged, he said, properly speaking, "not to the province of Arts and Sciences, but to the province of social life"; it was to be defined simply as "an act of violence in-

tended to compel our opponent to fulfil our will." So far, so good. The doctrine is perhaps repulsive; we may think with reason that we see looming behind the words of Clausewitz the figure of Bismarck and the ruthless policy of nineteenth-century Prussia; yet we cannot well deny that here we have the essential nature of war, stripped of sentimental tinsel. It is not from Clausewitz's definition that modern opinion dissents, but from the fashion in which he applied it. It was his argument that the means of attainment of the desired political object was, first, foremost, and always, *the destruction of the enemy's military force*. This, he repeats again and again, is "the foundation stone of all action in war." Hence *the fight*, however applied, is the only real means for the attainment of one's object in war; what he calls "the bloody solution of the crisis" is not to be avoided. This doctrine was derived by Clausewitz from his study of the campaigns of Napoleon, with their great display of energy and of concentration of effort culminating in sledge-hammer blows directed against the enemy's main forces in the field. These were the means adopted by the great French captain to subdue the will of his opponent and force him to fulfil the Napoleonic policy; and his system, interpreted by Clausewitz, its high priest, dominated European military policy from his time until our own, and inspired Moltke and Foch. It issued in the "nation in arms" theory which covered Europe with huge armies recruited by universal conscription; and it reached its culmination in the Great War, when the hugest forces the world could furnish were hurled against each other to kill and be killed, and some ten million men fell. This stupendous spectacle of slaughter has caused some keen minds to question Clausewitz's insistence upon the *Vernichtung der feindlichen Streitkraft* as the fundamental of war. It is pointed out that his fervent belief in the destruction of the enemy's forces as the most direct means of subduing his will led him to consider that act

of destruction an end in itself rather than a means to an end. One of the radical British military students, Captain B. H. Liddell Hart, military correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph*, says of the German, that he "enumerated three general objects—the military power, the country, and the will of the enemy. But his vital mistake was to place 'the will' last in his list instead of first, and embracing all the others, and to maintain that the destruction of the enemy's main armies was the best way to ensure the remaining objects."¹ It is contended by Captain Liddell Hart and others that new weapons developed during the Great War supply means of striking blows far more effective against the enemy's "will to resist" than the bloody tactics of Borodino or the Somme, and that the victor in future war will be the combatant who exploits their possibilities to the full. The most daring of the British modernists, Colonel J. F. C. Fuller, prefaces his book, *The Reformation of War* (published in 1923), thus: "I intend inquiring into the nature of future warfare, not because I love or hate war, but because I believe war is of the inevitable, and that the greatest of all heresies and delusions concerning it is to suppose that the Great War of 1914-1918 is the last of all wars. That it may be the last of its kind I full-heartedly agree to, so much so that I believe the nature of the next great war will be totally different from the last; so different that, even if great nations go to war in 1950, the recent war will appear to those not far distant fighters as a struggle between barbaric hordes, a saurian contest, not mediæval but primæval, archaic, a turmoil, which in the history of the evolution of warfare is more distant from that day than the Marne was from Marathon."

Wherein will the difference lie? It will consist, according to Colonel Fuller and his school, in the fact that attack will be directed not primarily against the enemy's physical forces in

¹Cf. *Paris, or the Future of War* (1925).

the field, but against the nerve-centres of his national organization—against, in fact, his capital and other chief cities, and those who are directly responsible for the formation and maintenance of national policy. The successful soldier of the future will emulate Scipio Africanus, who, instead of attempting to crush Hannibal in Italy by sheer superior weight, “carried the war into Africa,” striking at “the true objective”—the will of Hannibal’s nation—and defending Rome before the gates of Carthage.² But he will have the advantage of Scipio in that modern science has prepared for him the means of leaping over the enemy’s defences by land and sea, of at once attaining the centre of that enemy’s power, and striking at it, immediately upon the commencement of hostilities and quite possibly without any formal declaration of war, what may well be a fatal blow. And these means upon which theorists rely to revolutionize the art of war are precisely those which another group of persons are at the moment striving to outlaw, or at least to restrict in action. Most important among them, perhaps, is the employment of aircraft on a great scale. On land, attention is focussed on the tank, whose potentialities are steadily widening as inventors succeed in increasing its speed and radius of action; and with respect to the sea, those who threaten the very existence of submarines have not prevented discussion of their possible use in large numbers in future war. And all these engines derive in the eyes of critics a greatly intensified significance from their possibilities as mediums in chemical warfare; for the most advanced expert opinion regards *gas* as the preëminent weapon of the present and future, and gas can be projected not only from cylinders, as in the days of its first use, and by means of shells, but also by aerial bombs or as a spray from containers carried by tanks or aircraft, or naval vessels. The

²Cf. Captain Liddell Hart’s biography of Scipio, *A Greater than Napoleon* (Blackwood, 1926).

prophets draw compelling word-pictures of the possible effect of operations in which all these weapons were utilized to the fullest extent. Colonel Fuller, by way of driving home his argument, suggests what might be done by submarines which could "carry six large tanks each" and aeroplanes capable of transporting "seven tons of liquid gas apiece, or a small tank of equal weight" in the way of imposing the will of a foreign power on Great Britain by a surprise invasion. The recent spectacle of the Dornier plane successfully carrying over twelve tons in passengers makes it evident that he does not very greatly over-rate the possibilities of the weapons with which he deals. A fanciful picture which he gives us of tanks descending from the air and proceeding down the Edgware Road to Westminster, incapacitating all who meet them by the emission of gases which produce uncontrollable laughter or sneezing, is admittedly not meant to be taken quite literally; but in all seriousness, the destruction which could be wrought in a large city by concentrated attacks carried out by powerful forces of aeroplanes equipped to emit lethal gas or to drop great numbers of heavy high-explosive or gas bombs is too horrible to contemplate. And the extreme centralization and mechanization of a modern civilized community renders it particularly vulnerable to such enterprises. Rapid strokes against railways, bridges, centres of wireless and telephone communication, power stations, and the like, could cause desperate confusion. The action of aircraft might be seconded, where geography permitted, by that of fleets of fast tanks launched across country against the ganglia of enemy power. Here surely are terribly direct means of undermining national determination, of "compelling our opponent to fulfil our will." "Imagine for a moment," says Liddell Hart, "London, Manchester, Birmingham and half a dozen other great centres simultaneously attacked, the business localities and Fleet Street wrecked, Whitehall a mass of ruins, the slum

districts maddened into the impulse to break loose and maraud, the railways cut, factories destroyed. Would not the general will to resist vanish, and what use would be the still determined fractions of the nation, without organization and central control?"

In view of Mr. Hoover's utterances, it is interesting to observe that the advocates of "the true objective" point to the use of blockade in the Great War as one of few instances of the recognition during that struggle of the desirability of striking directly at the will of the enemy nation. "It was not long," says Colonel Fuller, "before the General Staffs of the contending nations realized that, if the food supply of the enemy could be cut off, the will of the hostile civil population would be undermined, and with this loss of will to endure, their military forces would be rendered useless." Hence arose the allied surface blockade of Germany, and hence also the attempt of Germany to blockade England by the only means at her command—the use of submarines against merchant vessels.

It would be foolish to deny that the modernists who advance these theories are open to criticism in some respects. They constantly exaggerate for effect—the usual fault of missionaries for new ideas. They are apt to minimize physical difficulties and exalt potentialities, and to deal in large phrases whose realization in material terms would not be a simple matter. Their argument throughout is almost entirely one-sided; they take little heed of the fact that the weapons whose possibilities they describe are useful for defensive as well as for offensive action, and that the attacker could not expect to have things all his own way unless he had a great superiority in *matériel* such as could be acquired only by vast and expensive preparations. Surprise would of course give him a great advantage; but the difficulty of concealing large preparations would militate against the possibility of catching the

enemy napping. These considerations tend to make less likely that decision of a war at the first blow, which figures prominently among the possibilities which they discuss; and in fact their stress upon it is probably designed simply as a means of shocking England into being on her guard. On the other hand, it seems more than probable that they are fully justified in assuming that the tank, the aeroplane, and the submarine will be the deciding factors in any future hostilities, and that through their agency gas will play a great part. The record of the later stages of the Great War appears to support their view in this. The slaughter inflicted on the retreating Turks in Palestine in 1918 by low-flying aeroplanes, which resulted in the complete and final destruction or dispersal of several divisions, is graphically described by Colonel Lawrence in *Revolt in the Desert*; in Italy a similar fate overtook the Austrians on the Conegliano-Pordeonone road. German air-raids on London caused the loss of many lives³ but were not adequate to destroy the spirit of the English people. War to-day would mean a renewal of such visitations, but with their destructive power increased many fold; it may be questioned whether civilian morale could long sustain them. It is well known that the Armistice put an end to British plans for reprisal raids on Berlin which would probably have been more severe than anything London herself had had to withstand. As for tanks, they made their way slowly in military estimation; but at the end of 1917 the battle of Cambrai gave a convincing demonstration of their value, and the lesson was applied the next year, in the great attack east of Amiens on August 8th, which was led by 450 tanks, and whose success was recognized by Ludendorff as the beginning of the end. Since then their speed and general handiness have been much improved; and though they have yet to prove in action their utility as long-

³In England as a whole some 1,400 persons were killed. It is only fair to note that the effectiveness of London's defensive measures had greatly increased by 1918.

range mobile weapons, there seems little doubt of their doing so should the opportunity arise. The fact that the projected campaign of 1919 on the Western Front was based on the use of two forces of tanks, one composed of fast machines which were to "rush through the enemy's fighting body and, making for all Divisional, Corps and Army Headquarters, paralyse these brain and nerve centres by direct attack," while the other was to be made up of heavier machines to precede the infantry, seems strong evidence of the possibilities of the tank as a raiding weapon.

Submarines and chemical warfare seem to receive their best assurance of future importance no less from their admittedly great influence on the course of the late war than from the obvious reluctance of the great powers to outlaw them. A proposal for the complete prohibition of poison gas in war and of the use of submarines against merchant shipping was incorporated in a five-power treaty as a result of the Washington Conference of 1921; but the failure of France to ratify it has made it ineffective. The Geneva conference of 1925 relating to the traffic in arms drew up a protocol forbidding the use of gas. This action was insisted upon by the American delegation, although it was pointed out to them that the preoccupation of the League of Nations was with the prevention of war, and not with rules for its conduct; yet the United States Senate refused to ratify the protocol when it was presented to them. The refusal has been attributed to lobbying by American chemical industries.⁴ France on the other hand has accepted this agreement (presumably because it makes no reference to submarines) and since Germany has also acceded to it, it is in effect between these two countries. But faith in the utility of such agreements is not fostered by consideration of the phrasing of a pertinent article written in the new edition

⁴C. Howard-Ellis, *The Origin, Structure and Working of the League of Nations* (Allen and Unwin, 1928).

of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* by Major-General A. A. Fries, Chief of the Chemical Warfare Service, U.S.A., and Professor J. E. Zanetti, a colonel in the American Chemical Warfare Reserves. It is worth quoting: "An authoritative letter published in the *Congressional Record* of December 13, 1926, brings out clearly the point that no proposed treaty, if such treaty should finally become effective, would prevent the United States from doing all work in chemical warfare that it felt necessary to ensure itself against surprise or disaster in war. Most military writers agree that chemical warfare is an effective and humane weapon and that its use on a large scale must be viewed as probable. Although stabilized warfare brought about and presents the greatest opportunities for the use of gas, the development of chemical warfare in connection with the aeroplane and the tank must be counted upon to make even more advantageous its employment in mobile warfare." In the face of opinions such as these, the likelihood of treaties being effective restraints when national existence is at stake seems inconsiderable.⁵

If, as appears to be the case, the new school of thought's belief in the supreme efficacy of these comparatively novel weapons in future warfare has a considerable basis in reason, we cannot disregard the possibilities inherent in the application of that special theory of war—the theory of the "true objective"—whose ends, it suggests, such weapons are admirably designed to serve. Viewed purely as a military proposition, as a possible means to the winning of a war, that theory is very strong indeed, particularly when it has such terrible handmaids at its beck. It cannot but present itself with great insistence to the mind of any future leader of a nation at war

⁵The complete neglect of the Powers to ratify the rules drawn up by the International Commission of Jurists at the Hague in 1923, which included prohibition of "aerial bombardment for the purpose of terrorizing the civilian population," is also noteworthy.

or faced with the possibility of war. What are its implications which such a leader must weigh?

There is a very serious one which he will not be able to escape. It must be perfectly obvious that a leader who adopts this policy of subjugating the will of his opponent by the most direct means possible must bid farewell to the old idea (which in truth has usually received lip-service rather than practical observance) that war is made only on the organized and uniformed forces of the enemy, and that care must be taken that "non-combatants" do not suffer. A direct attack on the determination of a nation entails of necessity action of one sort or another against civilians, including women. The modern weapons used for this object do not permit discrimination, even should the assailant wish to make exceptions. The coercion inherent in the allied blockade of Germany, and in the German air-raids against London and Paris, was quite indiscriminate. But, it is pointed out by the writers whose work we have been examining (they are quite prepared to brave popular disapproval), discrimination is in any case inconsistent with an adequate attack on the national will to resist. The civil population is the true depository of that will. Under modern conditions "entire nations go to war, not only as soldiers but as the moral and material suppliers of soldiers," and it is absurd to keep on parrying the spear-point when it is possible to sever the shaft and disarm your enemy at a blow. Colonel Fuller faces the fact with great frankness. "When it is realized," he says, "that to enforce a policy, and not to kill, is the objective, and that the policy of a nation, though maintained and enforced by her soldiers and sailors, is not fashioned by them, but by the civil population, surely, then, if a few civilians get killed in the struggle they have nothing to complain of—*'dulce et decorum est pro patria mori.'*" And, if they will not accept these words as their motto, then, in my opinion, their government should altogether abstain from war,

however much they may be spat upon." Some people may find this notion shocking; but it is far from illogical.

But, it is further argued by Colonel Fuller, war on the model which he suggests is actually in the long run far more humane than the practice of 1914-1918. For one thing, the desired effect may be obtained by the use of gases which are not lethal, but whose effect is only temporary; and in any case, if the figures quoted by him and by other advocates of chemical warfare are to be trusted, the proportion of deaths or permanent disablements to the number of casualties was in the Great War far less in the case of gas than with the more recognized weapons.⁶ Most important of all in his estimation, a stroke against the real centres of enemy power might produce a decision at far less absolute cost in lives than the old methods. "If a future war can be won at the cost of two or three thousand of the enemy's men, women and children killed, in place of over 1,000,000 men and incidentally several thousands of women and children, as was the case in France during the recent war, surely an aerial attack is a more humane method than the existing traditional type." Many persons will be inclined to think that here the author's enthusiasm has led him into undue exaggeration. War of this sort once begun would probably prove considerably more costly than it appears to his optimistic vision; and whether nations committed to conflict would constantly keep in mind his sound doctrine that the true purpose of war is to "enforce the policy of a nation at the least cost to itself *and enemy*", may well be doubted. It is not at all unlikely, however, it is in fact probable, that the great strain of war conducted in the fashion which he advocates would produce a decision at least before the loss of life mounted to the sickening standard which it reached in the Great War; though his policy is less apt to be adopted for that

⁶Many American authorities, notably Admiral Sims and General Fries, have also attempted to make a case for chemical warfare on humane grounds.

reason than for the simple fact that it offers the most effective means of beating down the enemy. Effectiveness is the supreme argument in time of war.

The contrast between the trend of advanced military theory, as represented by Captain Liddell Hart and Colonel Fuller, and that of the school of thought whose opinion finds expression in Mr. Hoover's Armistice Day speech, is rather staggering. Mr. Hoover believes in the possibility of using international legislation to give civilians even more complete immunity from enemy action than they enjoyed in theory under the "code of war" which was at least nominally in force in 1913; he wishes to save them not only wounds and death, but even hunger, and he appears to be of the opinion that this increased immunity would not be too dearly bought even at the necessary cost of provisioning enemy armies as well as women and children, and so enabling them to prolong the war and the slaughter which it occasioned. The soldiers at the same moment are advancing the thesis that under modern conditions it is not too much to expect civilians as well as soldiers to risk their lives for their country in time of war, and that a direct attack against the heart of the enemy's country, though it involves taking the lives of civilians, is actually the straightest path to a decision, and promises a shorter war and probably less actual loss of life than resulted from the clash of great armies on the Western Front; that, furthermore, this is the most effective method of using the weapons which recent invention has supplied. Here are two directly opposite forces; and the question arises whether Mr. Hoover's humanitarianism, even if incorporated in substantive treaties, will be strong enough to triumph over the military arguments, should another war occur.

In view of past experience, it seems very doubtful indeed. The recent history of warfare is a record of the triumph of military expediency over restrictions designed to "civilize" its

methods. By agreeing to the Declaration of Paris of 1856, Britain abandoned many of her old pretensions on the seas, and recognized that the goods of an enemy other than contraband of war should thenceforth be safe under a neutral flag, and that neutral goods found on an enemy's ship should be similarly immune. With the outbreak of the Great War, she found these regulations a hindrance to effective naval action against Germany, and without specifically repudiating the Declaration was forced to contravene its provisions in certain instances. This action led to difficulties with the United States, and was seized upon by Germany as an excuse for the adoption of submarine warfare against merchant vessels. She adopted that method, in defiance of the recognized laws of war, simply because she saw in it her best hope of victory. To quote Fuller again, "when . . . the blockade began to tighten Germany had no intention of committing *felo-de-se* in order to maintain a naval custom or a humanitarian tradition. She was now fighting for her life, and not being able to hit above the belt, she hit below it in order to make good by cunning her physical naval deficit." Having before them the statistics of 1917, showing how nearly her tactics succeeded, it is unlikely that nations finding themselves in the future in situations similar to Germany's will deny themselves the weapons she used. The great reluctance of France to agree to limitations on submarines is surely significant in this connection. Considerations of military expediency likewise prompted Germany in 1915 to disregard the Hague agreements of 1899 and 1907⁷ and begin chemical warfare; and although her adversaries called her names for doing so, they had no choice but to follow her example, and to-day, as we have seen, they show small inclination to abandon the weapon which they then took up.

⁷In 1899 the possible use of gas was discussed, and the employment of projectiles the sole object of which was the diffusion of asphyxiating or harmful gases prohibited; in 1907 it was forbidden to employ "poison or poisoned arms," or arms, etc., of a nature to cause unnecessary suffering.

It is difficult in these circumstances to avoid the conclusion that in striving to extend the scope of the old laws of war, Mr. Hoover is placing undue reliance on the future efficacy of a system which in the past has, when subjected to the fierce stress of existing war, totally failed to achieve its object. Up to the present, whenever the laws of war have come into collision with methods of attack which appeared to increase the chance of victory, they have gone to the wall; and it is much to be doubted whether we shall ever be treated to the spectacle of a defeated government explaining to its people that it sacrificed a chance of victory and continued national independence for the sake of a nice observance of the rules of the game. To continue to create artificial rules which are not likely to be observed seems simply an encouragement of mendacity in international relations.

Is the world, then, to abandon all hope of betterment and resign itself to a continued *régime* of unrestrainedly brutal wars? Not necessarily, surely. Though we may accept Colonel Fuller's estimate of the value of treaties designed to regulate the means used in waging war, we are not bound to swallow along with it his fatalistic belief that "war is of the inevitable." There is in sight at least a faint gleam of hope for release, appearing not in that hopeful process of "civilizing" warfare, which has never been more than a will o' the wisp, but rather in the very strong sentiment now existing against war itself, which is symbolized in the Kellogg Pact. It is easy to make fun of that instrument; and the mere fact that Mr. Hoover on a solemn public occasion has directed attention to what he considers to be the need for revising the rules for the conduct of that activity which it outlaws might seem to indicate that he has little personal faith in the Pact's efficacy. It is true that until now war has been a regularly recurring phase of human activity; no attempt to put an end to it has been permanently successful. But no previous attempt has had the

organization of a League of Nations behind it, and, most of all, no previous attempt has had the advantage supplied by the enormous weight of public opinion raised up against war by the greatest war in history. So the Kellogg system at least deserves a fair chance, for it is our only hope for avoidance of the horrors of war. Quite conceivably it may fail. But it has not failed *yet*; whereas the process of making war endurable by enacting rules for its waging has long since been tried and has failed miserably. Modern war once let loose knows no rule except the necessity of victory, so great are the interests at stake.

As for the civilian for whose comfort Mr. Hoover is so solicitous, if he is wise he will use what influence he may possess with his government to urge it to keep the peace. We have seen that military opinion is urging the point that modern weapons are most effective when directed, not against the enemy's army only, but against the heart of his nation. And if war is allowed to break out once more the contending nations may certainly be expected to use their weapons in the most effective manner possible. Those who expect the civilian to go scot-free in a possible encounter between great powers in the future would do well to consider an observation made a year or two ago by a most distinguished British general officer, in the course of a lecture on modern tendencies in military theory delivered to a group of English undergraduates: "Well, gentlemen, in wars up to the present time the civilian has gone out on the pavement and cheered as the troops marched away, and then he has gone in and broken the top of his egg and read all about it in the newspapers. Well, gentlemen, . . . he's never going to do it again."

In the event of the statesmen of the world failing to avert another great war, it is probable that that summation of the matter will prove to be highly accurate.

THE BASKET OF EGGS

BY WILFRID GIBSON

His boy drowned, Philip drowned—drowned in the lock . . .

A dozen and a half—he'd counted them,
Himself, into the basket—golden brown,
For the most part, though some chalk-white, and still warm
To the touch, and heavy, nigh four ounces each;
None better in the whole of Oxfordshire
He'd swear!—and as his lips had formed "eighteen",
Laying the last frail oval top of all,
It flashed into his mind then, the old saw,
The proverb against putting all your eggs
Into one basket . . . Strange it should have come
Into his mind that once of all the times
He'd filled the basket for the boy to take
To town of a morning—ay, and stranger still
He shouldn't have understood then what it meant,
Just what it meant to him, the saw—his eggs
All in one basket!—but had called his son
With no foreboding: and the lad had mounted
His wheel, and on the handlebar had slung
The fatal basket all too carelessly;
When he had bidden him sharply to take care,
Meaning he should be careful of the eggs.
Eggs! God, if he had only smashed the eggs,
Smashed them all there and then, and not set out!
But Philip had answered with a laughing word,
And shot off down the towpath towards the town,
As on so many mornings. All your eggs . . .

He'd watched his son a moment, as he rode
Whistling alongside the canal's grey stream
Of slower-moving waters; and just then
A young drake, finished preening his snowy feathers,
Half-rose and flapped his wings, as though he meant
To take flight, like his wilder kindred, straight
For some far unknown seashore—his tame heart
Stirred for a moment to unwonted wildness—
Only to turn once more to tail-up grubbing
Among the weeds and marigolds that fringed
The sluggish waters. And he, too, had turned
To do his grubbing in the garden-patch,
While naught but hopes and fears for his potatoes
Troubled his mind, until he heard . . .

His eggs—

“Eighteen”—his lips had formed the unbreathed word,
All in one basket! Eighteen—three more in number
Than Philip's years—Philip, his son, fifteen
That very morning . . . and now naught at all,
As though unborn . . .

The white drake with his ducks
Still feeding in the marigolds—and yet
Philip . . .

They'd found his body in the lock
Beside the unharm'd cycle, and the eggs—
Most of them still unbroken; but the basket
From which they'd spilled had floated down the stream.

The basket floated, the basket that, as the wheel
Had jolted, swinging from the handlebar,
Suddenly slewed with all its weight of eggs—
Four times eighteen was seventy-two—somewhere
About five pounds, he'd reckon, at the least—
And sent the cycle skidding down the bank,
Or so 'twas guessed. No one had seen the end—

The end of fifteen years, the end of all . . .
No one had heard a splash or the least cry—
If he'd had time to cry at all in that
Dread plunge to watery death! His corduroys
Caught in the pedal, he had been held down . . .
He'd been held down among the weeds and mud,
While his young life went up in airy bubbles
To where the basket floated—fifteen years
Of happy life went up in fifteen bubbles,
Maybe . . . Ay, he could see them even now
Rise slowly from the bottom and then race,
Nearing the surface, as though they were eager
To escape the clinging element and mingle
In the free atmosphere. One after one
The bubbles, Philip's life-breath . . . ten, eleven,
Burst in the sunshine . . . thirteen, fourteen, fifteen . . .

Fifteen that very morning—and then, no more!
Yet, there were eighteen eggs, all in one basket . . .
But Philip sixteen, let alone eighteen,
Would never see: fifteen, and then no more.

The basket floated, the empty basket floated,
When Philip sank to the bottom; and he, too, floated,
An empty basket on a sluggish stream
Idly drifting—and Philip in the grave!

All in one basket! And yet, why fifteen?
Fifteen, and then . . . Why should the boy have lived
To fifteen, if he'd never see sixteen?
Three-score-and-ten, that was man's proper span:
But fifteen years, that was no time to end—
No time at all! The boy had just begun
To ripen into manhood; and now all . . .
In him the Reeves must end, it seemed; with him
What unborn generations perished! Why—

Why had God let him live for fifteen years,
Only to die for ever?

If he'd died

With her, his mother, who'd died in giving him life,
Who died in vain, it seemed now—if he'd died
Then, or had even never breathed at all,
Surely it had been better! Fifteen years
Of living in the light, and then to lie
In darkness everlasting: fifteen years,
His son's life, lying wasted in the grave,
And his own thirty-five, too, dead beside them—
For had he not died, too, when the news came?

The white drake still among the marigolds
That fringed the margin of the grey canal,
Whose waters still, though sluggishly, flowed on—
The white drake still with all his snowy dames
Scattered and splashed among the yellow flowers
And glittering green—while he and Philip lay
Dead in the grave . . .

And now around the bend

A pied horse trod the towpath, and on its back
Rode a young laughing lad—his happy father
Slouching along beside the horse's head
With hands in pockets and his heart at ease,
While the taut rope tugged the slow-moving barge,
Blazoned in rainbow hues—the mother steering,
With calm untroubled eyes.

Nigh thirty ton

There must be in that barge, it rode so low
In the water with its cargo of cement:
And yet it rode, it floated, while his boy
Had gone to the bottom with his fifteen years—
But half the number . . . Strange that fifteen years
Should sink, while thirty tons—just double . . . But then

His own years, too—fifteen and thirty-five
Made fifty; and it seemed that fifty years
Weighed heavier than the cargo of cement
A barge could carry.

Now the bargee lifted
His boy down from the horse—reluctantly
The lad slid off—(How Philip had loved horses,
For all his wheeling!) Round another bend,
Hidden by drooping willows, they disappeared,
Walking together; and now a shout of laughter
Burst from them, and the mother raised her head
To listen, as the barge, too, disappeared.
And they'd go on together, go through life,
Father and son together, side by side;
While he and Philip, laid in death . . .

Nay! He
Must go on, and alone . . . yet, not alone;
For by his side a lad of fifteen years—
Still fifteen—though he, himself, should live life out
And touch three-score-and-ten—a happy lad
Of fifteen would keep step with him, till he, too,
Beyond dim whispering willows disappeared,
Though scarce with laughter; and the grey canal,
Still flowing sluggishly beneath the sky,
Should never know them more.

Gowan Bank, South View, Letchworth, Hertfordshire.

HISTORY AND THE NEW BIOGRAPHY

BY LIONEL M. GELBER

OUR age is an age of democracy. Since literacy has virtually become a prerequisite to participation in our political and economic order, the State has built a far-flung system of schools and practically everyone can read and write. Wealth has increased and prosperity has become widely diffused, with the result that there has emerged a vast body of people, hitherto unreckoned with, who have enlarged the market for printed matter and who not only want to read but wish to purchase such books and periodicals as may provide the vaunted emblems of education. Lord Northcliffe was one of the first to exploit this new development with his penny-dreadful press. But the shamelessness of the yellow press and the banality of the average novel hardly satisfied the newly-awakened urgings of those children of our time who were not entirely beyond redemption. For a thorough intellectual regimen they were not prepared; they demanded short-cuts to knowledge. Publishers and journalists, as is their wont, proved most accommodating. Many of the authoritative treatises on the more entertaining chapters of mankind's attainments were ransacked; a facile exposition of every field of human endeavour became the vogue. Mr. Wells blithely essayed to tell the history of the race in one volume; the abstruse delights of philosophy, the lofty soaring of religion, the abracadabra of science—all these, spiced and abbreviated in numerous outlines and summaries, have tumbled forth, one on top of the other, to gratify the inarticulate striving of a certain large, if intellectually half-baked, section of the community. The process does not slacken; it is a factor not to be neglected in literary and educational circles. It has begun

to appear as if, in the modern adaptation of Ecclesiastes, of the making of many popularizations there is no end.

Biography could not long remain in splendid isolation, untouched by the new fashion. It was Mr. Lytton Strachey in his *Eminent Victorians* who struck the tone of the recent tendencies in the New Biography and gave it its manner and direction. The example he set in this book taught his followers that they must be concise, lucid, clever, interesting and derisive of what he considered some of the typical idols of the nineteenth century—Dr. Arnold, General Gordon, Cardinal Manning, Florence Nightingale. It was Strachey's *Queen Victoria*, however, that finally launched the thousand ships of the New Biography. This brilliant book, to quote M. Maurois, portrayed Queen Victoria "as a fat and resolute little woman, full of pride, accessible to flattery, at the same time touching and ridiculous." This, the new school of biographers would have us believe, is a just estimate not only of a woman and a queen but of the age she symbolized. Soon from the shores of France, M. Maurois himself arrived, playing Alcibiades to his Socrates, Strachey, with his lives of Shelley and Disraeli. Then Emil Ludwig from his German horn of plenty poured forth his *Napoleon*, *Bismarck*, *William II*, *Goethe*, and so on. In England Mr. Philip Guedalla gave us *Palmerston*, Mr. Harold Nicolson stepped forward, and of late Mr. Strachey produced his *Elizabeth and Essex*. In the United States, as well as in England, a plethora of New Biographies has been published, many in vain imitation of the Stracheyan style or in that of his more noted disciples, and all quite as different from the standard school of biographical writing as Boswell was from Plutarch. What is it in the New Biography that has aroused so deep a hunger for information? Why its astonishing popularity?

It may be questioned whether there is anything of the inquiring mind at the bottom of this popularity, for the ac-

cepted standard volumes have barely their fractions of a thousand readers while these others have their tens of thousands. Nor is a genuine interest in the annals of the past the cause; if it were so this generation would perhaps be more eager to deal intelligently with the varied perturbations of the body politic for which an earnest reading of history should prepare it. The popularity of the New Biography is based not on intellectual but on sensational and emotional grounds. This is a democratic age and, as Dean Inge asserts in his recent book, "the art of success in a democratic society is to know how to play upon the ape in humanity. No privacy is sacred to the ape-mind. The democratic newspaper is full of gossip about individuals—details which could have no interest for any educated person." As usual, the Dean is a bit extreme; yet much that he says about the newspaper is true of the New Biography. There is good reason to venture the opinion that, unlike Shylock, the new biographers have traded their intellectual jewels for a wilderness of monkeys although Mr. Strachey, for instance, is too cultivated a man of letters to let this become too evident.

For, in the wake of the masters of the school, have arisen a number of journalistic criticasters whose biographical attention lingers too often on the episode, on the incident for the incident's sake, and not upon the main purpose of biography which should be much more serious. In the United States the so-called "debunking" has not stopped at Jefferson, Franklin, George Washington or even Bishop Asbury, but every frontier rogue, urban and rural, becomes the subject of a jazz muck-raking monograph blocking the channels to legitimate research. From Brigham Young to President Harding, from Barnum to Anthony Comstock, predatory millionaires, national politicians, highwaymen, thugs and pirates are being enshrined in a lurid Rabelaisian Pantheon. Perhaps all this has come to the front, both in the United States and England,

as a sort of literary compensation for the dull routine of modern society which stifles the natural instincts of immured men and women. Tired of the drab contours of the prevailing culture in most of our cities, through this new medium, with the specious glamour of authenticity, they re-live the strenuous activities of great vagabonds and sturdy beggars; they visualize the scarlet hues of mighty sinners and legendary men of derring-do. The New Biography is therefore to that extent an escape from the ugly landscape of our life, from the gray unreal world of reality into the vivid real world of unreality.

As high-class journalism the flexible technique of the New Biography has been arranged for its audience. It finds the path of knowledge no longer tortuous and steep; it endorses the methods of all popularization and sugar-coats its pills, the panacea for the intellectual maladies of the commonalty. It adopts an excited, colourful style; it simplifies its problems so that by intriguing catchwords it will attract and hold its readers and make itself understood by them. Ludwig sees Goethe's life as a grand pitched battle between poet and thinker and the pacification of a conflict between his Genius and Daemon from which he wrested a kind of tragic victory; Napoleon's as a war between mathematics and fantasy; and Bismarck's as an oscillation between many forces; while Strachey builds up the picture of an era in *Eminent Victorians* from a very few personages who are not necessarily characteristic of an age so intricate, contradictory and versatile. To go farther afield, Maurois takes pride in explaining the subtle theme of peacocks in his life of Disraeli; he reduces Shelley to the figure of Ariel. In the New Biography Byron becomes Allegra. For one author Nathaniel Hawthorne is simply a rebellious Puritan, for another he is a study in solitude; Cervantes is the ingenious hidalgo, while Walt Whitman is a magnificent idler. The many-sidedness of a famous human being is levelled down to flat planes and

straight lines. The mysteries of personality stand revealed by the touchstone of an arresting phrase; the formula is the man. It is so easy, so chatty, so enthrallingly diverting, yet, withal, a perfect strangler of the critical faculties. For the New Biography is a hybrid literary species masquerading in fancy dress, the semblance of a tale not only full of entrancing sound and fury but of men who lived, moved and had an actual being.

This fancy dress, however, can seldom disguise the New Biography since it is so often merely the single drape of Venus. For its special appeal is its constant heed to the amorous peccadilloes, the casual improprieties of its subjects. It is this side of human conduct that engages the attention of both writer and reader. Where the subject deviated from the *mores*, as we know them, he is made most interesting. That these deviations may not have then meant immorality, as we judge it in a later age, and are in any case but side issues in the lives of most historic figures, does not disturb the New Biographers as they continue to desecrate the tombs of forgotten *chroniques scandaleuses*. Of the dead nothing but the scandalous; particularly since it gives the average man and woman something of a furtive, unpuritanic thrill; since no matter how strong the spirit, the willing flesh can thus share vicariously in an overwhelming passion, a great sin. In the New Biography satyr and satire too familiarly meet. The new psychology, probably less the Behaviourism of Mr. Watson than the Misbehaviourism of Professor Freud, is at once the vindication and instrument of this concurrence. Not that writers of the twentieth century were the first to probe the inmost recesses of the human mind; even Plutarch felt that a matter of less moment, an expression or a jest, informs us better than a great deed of the character of a man. Suetonius' *Lives of the Caesars* or St. Augustine's *Confessions* were no strangers to the sort of thing the New Biography might like; while for sheer gusto they will have to go far to equal the

gallopade of personality expressed by Cellini or Pepys. Nor were Boswell and the nineteenth century annalists and biographers deficient in their comprehension of human nature. But the new psychology, more especially psycho-analysis, has been raised to the dignity of a science; it has become a literary fetish, and if its harsh jargon finds difficulty in merging with the cadences of English prose the same cannot be said of its lack of reticence. It is behind the ramparts of this science that much of modern literature, whatever its underlying motive, finds a sanction and a defence. In the New Biography the subconscious covers a multitude of sins.

It also covers a multitude of historical manipulations. Thus Mr. Strachey, to permit the unfolding of Elizabeth's 'tragic' love for Essex, deliberately chooses that final period of her reign—the prelude to the advent of the Stuarts—after her great work that meant so much for England had been completed. If he had desired to contribute to the elucidation of Elizabeth's character and achievements—for they cannot be dissociated—this is surely a curious way of doing so; and by the very fragmentary nature of this work Mr. Strachey, the master of the New Biographers, repudiates their plea that they contrive to make their readers see their subjects steadily and see them whole. This choice of period, in fact, the choice of characters and period by all the New Biographers, is obviously for purposes of sensation; here is no ambition to solve a historic problem but to sparkle and attract attention. Of course Mr. Strachey exercises a kind of discretion; so do M. Maurois and Ludwig. But the love of the sensational is there, prominent, self-conscious and beckoning. It cannot be to enlighten the investigations of staid scholars in cloistered quadrangles that all the lovely fallen ladies since the Renaissance have found themselves restored from the limbo of the past to be paraded, in the words of the poet, for "the love of folly and the scorn of fools." Yet there they are, unmistak-

ably enough, mincing their saucy way down the avenues of the New Biography: Nell Gwynn, Ninon de Lenclos, Madame du Barry, the wives of Henry VIII, Regency ladies, Madame de Pompadour and others who, if seldom the captains of their own souls, were often mistresses of more august ones. It is therefore doubtful whether the New Biographers are as much concerned with women of the past as with women with a past, and while they might have us believe that the proper study of mankind is man they persuade us that there can be no such proper study, since it must always be faintly improper.

But this, of course, is a matter of taste. It is in their methods that the New Biographers are fundamentally misleading. The nineteenth century biographers were often tedious and prolix. They did not guide themselves in Strachey's mode of "becoming brevity"—a mode which fits in well with a practical precaution against fatiguing his popular audience. Yet if many of the Victorians have erred in the matter of length, we should not overlook the fact that Macaulay, Trevelyan the elder, Froude and Morley left us shorter biographical portraits of the highest literary and historical merit that no Georgian has been able to emulate. Again, the new school would make a pretence to a scrupulous use of historic materials. Mr. Strachey, in *Eminent Victorians* and *Queen Victoria*, it is the contention of M. Maurois, let his characters emerge through their own letters, conversations, actions; he utilized primary sources and let these speak for themselves; Strachey, accordingly, like Bismarck at the Congress of Berlin, pretends to be an honest broker, never condemning overtly and palpably, never praising. Yet in *Elizabeth and Essex* Mr. Strachey abandons entirely his position of allowing the records to reveal his characters—a position untenable from the start by reason of his disingenuous choice of records to make most of his characters appear in an unfavourable light. Bacon has aroused Strachey's ire; and

in two incomparable and bitter passages (pages 44 and 249) he describes him as some perfidiously magnificent serpent—especially after his share in the trial of Essex, his erstwhile friend. Whatever Bacon was, Strachey seems unjust and prejudiced. But it is not upon Bacon alone that Strachey vents his spleen. He reveals none of the greatness of the really great men who surrounded Elizabeth; perhaps in contrast to the Bacons, the Raleighs, the Robert Cecils, even to Essex, Mr. Strachey would cast Elizabeth's extraordinary competency in sharper relief.

So long, in fact, as the New Biographers shorten their biographies to keep the reader's interest unflagging (and Ludwig is only superficially an exception to this rule) the materials must be ruthlessly selected. The possibility of getting an adequate portrait of the man in relation to his background is therefore dubious. It was never required to set down everything in a man's life; but with its faults, the standard biography usually contained all the material necessary to obtain a comprehensive picture of the subject. In the New Biography we must depend entirely for selection upon the caprice of the biographer who may have a bright journalistic style but no claim to scholarship or to impartiality. Disraeli said in *Contarini Fleming*: "Read no history, read only biography, for that is life without a theory." What would Disraeli say were he to see Maurois' maudlin caricature? It is not for nothing that the sins of the New Biography are as much sins of omission as sins of commission.

Like the novelist, the New Biographer detaches the episodes he prefers and concentrates attention upon these, which he would exhibit as a full exploration of his subject's character. But the root of the New Biographer's resemblance to the novelists is in his addiction to the reverie, a mixture of criticism and comment, which permits the analyst, at a moment of crisis when the records fail, to leap into the dark of his

subject's mind. There is nothing to curb the range of these high imaginings. This dramatic leaven gives a touch of indubitable artistry to the New Biography which mere workaday historical fact could never lend. If the soliloquy has become *passé* on the stage it has found an abode for itself here; in this respect the New Biography is old-fashioned. If such powers of insight and clairvoyance may come to Mr. Strachey rather obscurely, they would be more intelligible in Guedalla, Maurois and Ludwig who are, after all, in direct line from the Prophets. But it is not often, even in the New Biography, that so remarkable a series of soliloquies are found as those which Strachey attributes to Elizabeth as she is about to order the execution of Essex. "It is not difficult," he says, "to guess the steps by which she reached her final conclusion"—and for over four pages of excellent psychological and literary invention Mr. Strachey demonstrates his skill at guessing. Thus, through the otherwise opaque windows of Elizabeth's soul, we are given the inestimable privilege (a right which even a constitutional monarch, in a similar situation, might not yield freely) of seeing the doom of Essex take shape—not because he was a traitor altogether, but because he had outraged Elizabeth's vanity; because through Essex, the daughter of Anne Boleyn could avenge the death of her mother on all men with the mailed fist of a daughter of Henry VIII; because of even vaguer impulses such as Essex's far-fetched representation of Manhood which, in the depths of her frustrated woman's being, she hated. It is written, "she smiled sardonically": it must be true since it is Mr. Strachey's royal prerogative to know.

Perhaps the real paradox of the iconoclastic biographers is the atmosphere of sentimentality with which they surround not only the reverie but the whole treatment of their subjects. In many ways the feeling is genuine, but mawkish sentimentality is the quickest emotion, except under dire stress, that

will move masses of people; and it is for these that the New Biographers would seem to write. Here is too frequently the pinchbeck sentimentality of the movies, the radio, the magazines and not the fine emotional quality of a Morley or the most puissant rage of a Carlyle. We can quite easily weep our way through much of Ludwig and Maurois; while Strachey, more reserved, differs in degree if not in kind. For some, the stream of history is a stream of blood; for this school it is a flood of tears.

Not that the stream of history is of especial interest to the New Biographers. Maurois considers biography as some sort of artistic solace for the biographer, a communication by the writer with the reconstituted personality: as in the case of Shelley and Disraeli, the kind of life the biographer would have liked to live if circumstances had been different. The self-expression of the writer rather than the expression of the subject is the keynote of the New Biography. We see something of this in Mr. Strachey, in the sentimentality in which he immerses his heroines, Victoria and Elizabeth, while with less mercy he plucks the beards of his dead lions. The elegant Mr. Guedalla went to Oxford and he considers this one of his greatest achievements which, as with Max Beerbohm, he will never suffer you to forget; and if Guedalla would not go so far as to assure you that for want of a *bon mot* a kingdom was lost, nevertheless he would be little loath to sacrifice that kingdom for an epigram. Maurois has something of a passion for English aristocracy and he would sing a lyric through life, usually another man's felicitously transformed, at a slightly snobbish pitch. Ludwig should wear a Byronic collar as he tries to secure an apocalyptic catalogue of conflicting soul-forces and amours. With the possible exception of Mr. Guedalla, all these men write biography as *belles lettres*, as an artistic medium to express their opinions or philosophy rather than as thoroughgoing comment on the life of action, or as

accurate rehabilitation of significant personalities of the past. Biography has always been literary art; but it has remained for a group in this somewhat matter-of-fact, commonplace generation to combat in historical investigation the relatively scientific influence of a Lecky, a Stubbs, a Gardiner, an Acton, and re-make modern biography as a highly imaginative literary art. This is an incongruity, explicable on so many grounds, that should not be ignored.

No one can deny to the New Biographers a measure of justice in arraying themselves against garrulous, dry-as-dust pedantry. Standard biography of the better type could advantageously borrow some of the vitality of the new school, something of the ideas they propounded at the outset if not the methods they are now following. But the distorted emphasis and undue proportions of the New Biography are rendering a much greater disservice to historical clarification than any lack of pungency in the standard work. It often reconstructs history on a purely fantastic and picturesque basis until most barriers between the historical novel and the novel historical writing of a Strachey, a Maurois, or a Ludwig and their shining company cease to exist. While playing upon the pipes of modern historical scholarship and luring us with bewitching melodies they are infusing soft alien tunes which imaginative literature may welcome but against which historical literature must rigorously turn a deaf ear. The New Biography is a particularly formidable Siren because it makes itself so plausible. While Mr. Guedalla is primarily a historian, Mr. Strachey is not; and Ludwig and Maurois, the apologists of the school, expressly deny their intention to write history. But in avoiding the critical judgment of historians on the pretext that they do not set out to write history, the New Biographers are like so many mischievous small boys who warn us that they propose to misbehave, assuming that by so doing they absolve themselves from all blame for their errors

and misdeeds. But although this may be gay deception, it is deception none the less. Mischief is not to be condoned merely because we are notified that it is going to be done. If the New Biographers do not wish to be guided by a minimum of the indispensable hard and fast rules of the modern study of the past they should choose vehicles of literary expression that will not force them so severely to bridle the fleet steeds of their fancy. Poetry may be able to experiment with its forms and content; it must deal with another aspect of human experience which needs not always to be pinned down. But history and biography cannot afford to leave the beaten track of all scientific research, for even the most painstaking historical narrative is only an approximation to the truth. If we find it so hard to arrive at the truth with concrete evidence as we have it, how much more difficult will the task be if these abstract, latter-day intuitionists are to inform us. That way lies dogma and special pleading.

Since these New Biographers are exclusively absorbed in painting the portrait of their subjects on a scale over-simplified to hold the reader's interest, they see no need for painting the epoch, the circumstance, the *milieu* which gave them significance. Not to illustrate "the times" as well as "the life" is something Macaulay, Froude and Carlyle would never have understood, regardless of the efforts of the New Biographers to imitate them in trying to restore historical biography to literature—efforts which might be called for if there had been a real divergence. Standard English biographical writing in the later part of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth—under soberer and more literal wing than Macaulay, Froude and Carlyle—has in this respect been much closer than is the New Biography to the so-called 'literary historians.' By choosing figures of historic importance the New Biographers tacitly admit their debt to history. Since they are constrained to make this concession they should go the whole way and paint

the man where his life had its full meaning, where it is linked to its social context. Maurois' *Disraeli* scarcely suggests that England's gratitude to her great statesman was due to positive accomplishment and not to the escapades of a captivating and audacious necromancer. Guedalla in his *Palmerston* has somewhat the same fault. Ludwig and Strachey are no exceptions; Strachey in *Elizabeth and Essex*, indeed, sets out to show feudalism, whispering the last enchantments of the Middle Ages, finally made into a lost cause by the sure triumph of the Renaissance—the one embodied by Essex, the other by Elizabeth. But the fit of the New Biography is soon upon him, and he conveniently forgets that Elizabeth and Essex were first envisaged by him as protagonists in a high social drama. Thus the New Biography does not examine the soil wherein the roots of eminence are planted. It is therefore little more than pleasant literary and psychological production given the simulacrum of a local habitation and an historical name. It dwells in an incredible twilight land of fact and fancy, of fable and reality. For if its hand is the hand of the student of history, its voice is the voice of novelist, essayist and journalist.

The historical phase of true biography, then, must not be gainsaid. If, as Carlyle thought it to be, history is the essence of innumerable biographies, it is a rather strange essence of history that we can capture from the New Biography. This age of sociology and economics has tended in historical writing to subordinate the great man while emphasizing the mass-movements that gave him birth. The New Biography, in no exalted Carlylean sense, may be a reaction from the puppet theory of the materialists—although it is a peculiar swing back that would belittle great men while rescuing them from the past. Diametrically the reverse of this reaction was Tolstoy's monumental aim in his *War and Peace* to prove, through the irrational heat of a mighty struggle, that there

are inevitable forces which drive men on as if by some fore-ordained dispensation; that even a Napoleon, chained by Necessity, was but the feeble symbol of an insurgence and revolution over which neither he nor any other human could exert control. Overpowering as Tolstoy built his thesis, it was in some ways the negation of history; and to this sort of thesis it is the special mission of biography to oppose its findings. It is the function of biography to indicate how far-reaching, rough-hewn social forces come to bear the impress of great personalities who chisel and shape them precisely as Michael Angelo perfected his formless material; to show that without a Julius Caesar, a Charlemagne, a Luther, a Calvin, a Cromwell, a Chatham, a Washington, a Napoleon, the course of history would inexorably have been different because instead of converging in them it would have been diffused. And it is this power of great personalities to tame and hold in leash the unsubdued, political, social, economic and spiritual elements of their time and place that the New Biographers show few signs of appreciating. The test to be employed in writing the biography of a great man is whether particular facts have any permanent effect on the man himself and whether through him they have vitalized the period or his work. For in history it is his work alone that is of importance. Biography divorced from its historical environment is irrelevant. In such a state it may depict, as in Strachey, consummately artistic portraits of human beings but yet historically disembodied creatures suspended, like Mohammed's coffin, between earth and sky. The things that count in the career of a great man are those that have an enduring and lasting value. To specialize, as does so much of the New Biography, in chronicling beguiling incidents and events may be interesting gossip but it is not history or biography. The New Biographers will have to render unto fiction the things that are fiction's and unto truth the things that are ascertainably true. In the meantime Clio,

the Goddess of History, mourns on the Mount to see Biography, once one of her noble brood, don the ill-assorted vesture of Mrs. Grundy.

But in nothing has the new school distinguished itself from the usual writers of biography more than in its disparaging attitude towards many of the great figures of the past. Mr. Strachey in his first biographical work, perhaps with salutary effect, demolished some of our reverence for eminent Victorians. He continued the procedure in *Queen Victoria*. From him the New Biography, in the United States rather more than in England, has acquired a hyper-critical habit of mind, often with justification but as frequently without. Not that historic truth is served by shrouding the failings of great personalities with a cloak of respectability. Plutarch in his life of Pericles claimed our intellectual vision "must be applied to such objects as by their very charm invite it onward to its own proper good. Such objects are to be found in virtuous deeds; these implant in those who search them a great and zealous eagerness which leads them on." A monitory and pedagogical task such as Plutarch esteemed for biography, such as Plato would have conceived for the whole educational pattern of the State, scarcely coincides with the dim obligations of their art as the New Biographers perceive it. Yet up to very recent times this conception has been characteristic of much of the biography that has found a niche for itself in world literature. An over-laudatory attitude on the part of some of the standard biography has probably made the pendulum swing too far in the opposite direction. Yet we have managed until now to know something of the frailties of great men of the past without losing sight of their fundamental greatness. The New Biographers have lost their sense of historic perspective. Weaknesses cannot be concealed in a true and an adequately proportioned portrait but the New

Biography would elevate the weaknesses to the image of the man.

It was natural that the twentieth century should be rather disdainful and supercilious towards the nineteenth century, as was the nineteenth towards the eighteenth. The genesis of the revolt against Victorianism may be traced back to 1864 when Matthew Arnold horrified a middle-class, essentially no more self-complacent than our own middle-class to-day, with his dismal refrain, "Wragg is in custody." Much water has passed under the bridge which connects us with the Victorians, but nothing has been more decisive than the War. For post-war conditions engendered a passive mood of disenchantment which has pervaded many of the more sensitive minds who emerged from the ordeal of fire softened and lax in all their convictions. Of Mr. James Joyce and the foul chaos in which he presents his *Odyssey* of modern life little need be said; Mr. Eugene O'Neill in the drama would better represent this temper of futility. Mr. Aldous Huxley has perhaps with more Swiftian discernment disclosed the moral gropings of his contemporaries; their lack of anchorage, their need of some inner armoury of the spirit. We have failed to feel intensely about anything; and this is profoundly the basic spiritual shortcoming of our age. The New Biographers reflect this, just as every literature must reflect the life of the times. They too hedge away from a noble enthusiasm, a high cause. They would seem to scoff at the durable works of the great men they describe; rather they would tend to deny the attributes of greatness to their subjects. The nineteenth century had many faults; many of its ideals were flatulent, and the New Biographers are not tilting against illusory windmills of cant and hypocrisy. But on looking about our own scene of action any gesture of superiority towards the Victorians comes from us with ill grace. Let us take more fully into account the age of Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Chesterton, M. Poincaré, Mr.

Kipling, Mr. Hoover, Mr. Baldwin before getting even a little arrogant towards a preceding age. No man is a hero to his valet—and the New Biographers, clothing their subjects in the garb of ridicule, place themselves in the rôle of spiritual valets.

To create this attitude gratuitously, merely for the sake of literary skepticism and not in the interest of establishing historic truth, is surely frivolous in a democratic society where mediocrity and conformity reign with unquestioned authority. The New Biography not only creates a one-sided picture of the past; it enlarges the sense of importance in solemn if fairly trivial public figures who, puffed up with the knowledge that some of the great people of the past appear ordinary, rush in where even the ablest fear to tread. In one sense the New Biography, like much of contemporary life and literature, could well be cleansed by the affirmation of a new Romanticism. Not that there must be revived an unrealistic cult of Heroes and Hero-Worship. The contribution of the critical historians more than the New Biographers would seem to have been greatest in preventing that. But soberly and unquixotically the mocking dilettantism of the New Biographers must be put aside in favour of respect for indestructible values, of uncompromising obstinacy of faith, and of a reasoned idealism. To follow the New Biography to its logical conclusion would lead to a most disheartening interpretation of history; one in which the pillars of Church and State are set in shifting sands; in which all kinds of self-deluded personages have posed interminably in the centre of the world-stage. A little less pre-occupation with psycho-analysis, and a little more regard for ethic, might enable them to see that they are indicating nothing of the rigidity of the great principles which animated the creative figures of the past and which must animate the truly creative figures of the present.

In making man the measure of all things the least they

can do is to measure him at his highest and to paint man as he means most to history, in relation to his ideals. If biography must condemn, as often it must, let it condemn for the things by which posterity was affected, not for the transient foible or isolated adventure that is not woven into the insubstantial fabric of which civilization is wrought. Modern biography must be cautioned not to forfeit scientific precision to an over-imaginative interpretation. More especially it must recall, in view of the constructive and memorable achievements of its subjects, that without the charity that hopeth all things and endureth all minor failings, biographers who speak with the tongue of angels will be but "sounding brass and tinkling cymbals." Michelet speaks somewhere of a kind of history as a resurrection. If the New Biography is a sign of the way we are going to treat the past and the men who laid upon it the stamp of their original genius, there is grave danger that we shall have to pray for their own sake against the immortality of great historical souls.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN UPPER CANADA, 1791-1841

BY A. H. YOUNG

IN discussions of the University Question and of the Clergy Reserves, the Church of England in Upper Canada between the years 1791 and 1841 is commonly represented as little more than a nefarious political instrument. In the hands of a certain diabolical person named John Strachan it was, moreover, being unscrupulously manipulated, it is declared, for the purpose of securing privileges subversive of the civil and the religious rights of the inhabitants of the province who happened to belong to other communions. Such is the travesty of history presented to their readers by writers who accept as the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth the utterances of political partisans like Egerton Ryerson and William Lyon Mackenzie without comparing them with the testimony of other witnesses who are at least as competent as they.

Whatever was the case before Strachan published his funeral sermon on Dr. Jacob Mountain, the first Bishop of Quebec, and the earlier edition of his *Ecclesiastical Chart*, concerning which there is much to be said, it is absolutely certain that afterwards he was kept very persistently in the background by both the second Bishop, Stewart, and the Lieutenant-Governor, Sir John Colborne, not to forget the chief ruler of the Church in Upper Canada, the S. P. G. (Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts). Sir John, as his correspondence proves, expressed to Stewart his satisfaction that Strachan, then newly created Archdeacon of York, had not been allowed to go to England in 1828 to appear before the parliamentary committee which in that year was inquiring into the civil government of the Canadas. He

likewise testified to his displeasure at the adversaries of the Church speaking and writing as though the terms "Church of England" and "John Strachan" were convertible. They were very far from being so before 1839, when Strachan at last became bishop and when only he obtained the chief, if not the sole, right to represent the Church and to tender advice on the formulation of its policy.

After all, the object aimed at by the four bishops who preceded Strachan between 1791 and 1839 (Inglis, Jacob Mountain, Stewart, and George J. Mountain) had been the full acceptance of the provisions and the implications of the Canada (or Constitutional) Act of 1791 as they and their superiors, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Imperial Government's Ecclesiastical Board, and the Venerable Society, understood them. Into that Act, notwithstanding the Right Honourable Henry Dundas's reported utterances regarding the rights of the Established Church of Scotland, had been gathered up, to all appearance, the whole policy regarding the Church of England which had been evolving from precedent to precedent in the Colonial Office for nearly two centuries.

The evolution of a definite policy for the establishment of the Church of England in the colonies had been begun by the authorities in England as early as the time when Archbishop Laud was Bishop of London. Of the working out of this policy and its extension, a fairly good idea can be obtained from books such as Professor Arthur Lyons Cross's *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies*, Jos. A. Waddell's *Annals of Augusta County, Virginia*, and the *Dinwiddie Papers*, published some sixty years ago by the Virginia Historical Society. One point of special importance was the position accorded to the Bishop of London in the government of the Church in the colonies, plantations, and factories abroad.

When the union of the parliaments of England and Scotland was being negotiated in the year 1706, the continu-

ance to the Church of England of its status as the Established Church was carefully provided for. In the Act of Union, which came into operation in the following year, there was, accordingly, incorporated a section guaranteeing the rights and the status of the Church in the colonies. On the other hand, acknowledgment was made in the Act that the Church of Scotland was to continue to be the Established Church of the northern kingdom, which, by the way, had practically no colonies. By implication, if not by direct statement, therefore, the latter Church was to be established in Scotland only, and not in the colonies.

In accordance with this general policy of the English Crown and with the declaration of the Act of Union, the Church of England was established in Nova Scotia by the local legislature in the year 1758, as it had been established by similar bodies in other colonies at dates still earlier. In accordance also with the practice followed in the Island colonies and in several of those on the continent of North America—the Carolinas, Virginia, Maryland, and part of New York, for example—allotment of glebes, etc., was made in Nova Scotia, and salaries for incumbents were provided by the local government. The same kind of action was taken by the legislature of New Brunswick after its creation by Royal Order in Council in the year 1784.

In default of the passing of the necessary legislation by the Provincial Legislatures of Lower and Upper Canada, the Church was never established in either province. It was endowed, which is a very different thing, and by the one authority who had the right to bestow the endowment, the British Parliament, representing the British taxpayer, whose money had paid for every acre of land purchased from the Indians in order to provide homesteads for the settlers. This landed endowment, called the Clergy Reserves and comprising one-seventh of the total acreage of every township, was provided

for by the Canada Act. Over the Reserves was waged from 1819 to 1854 a bitter warfare by the Church of Scotland, in the first place, by the non-established Presbyterians and the various branches of Methodism, in the second, and in the third by the Baptists and the Congregationalists, who did not desire State support for themselves. Even the Roman Catholics lent a hand, which was not unnatural, considering the eagerness displayed at times on the part of the "Protestants" to share in the revenues of the confiscated Jesuits' Estates.

By the Confiscating Act of 1854, usually called the Secularization of the Clergy Reserves, the Church, with the consent of the Imperial authorities, was in large part disendowed. It was not disestablished by that Act, for it is a manifest absurdity to assert, as has been repeatedly done, that what was never established was disestablished. The Crown retained for three years longer the right to appoint bishops, which it had exercised from 1787 onward, as it has done, and still does, in England. Only in January, 1867, did the last vestige of this right disappear with the consecration of a Canadian bishop (Bethune) in Canada without the authority of a Royal Mandamus, which had theretofore been requisite, and without recourse to Canterbury, following the precedent set in 1861 at the consecration of Dr. Lewis as the first Bishop of Ontario, both prelates having been elected by clerical and lay members of their synods.

To understand fully the Canada, or Constitutional, Act so called, the thirty-fifth section of which recites the pertinent clauses of the Royal Instructions to certain governors as also those of the Quebec Act of 1774, it is necessary to remember that it was the final product of the long process of evolution just indicated. It has further to be borne in mind that the Colonial Office had a policy regarding the Church's important instrument, education, to mention nothing else, which, in spite of occasional blunders and not infrequent dilatoriness, it was

endeavouring to apply with consistency and with even-handed justice in the various parts of the Empire.

In accordance with this policy had been founded Church universities with more or less of State aid, King's College, Windsor, and King's College, Fredericton, now the University of New Brunswick. It was but logical, therefore, that King's College, York, now the University of Toronto, should have received, in 1827, a Royal charter as a Church institution together with an endowment of Crown lands.

In 1763 General Murray had been told in so many words that the Roman Catholic Church was in no wise to be regarded as the Established Church of Canada, for that was a privilege which could be accorded to the Church of England alone. The latter, it had been further intimated, His Majesty intended to establish,¹ but, for various reasons, of which Sir Guy Carleton, Lord Dorchester,² was probably the most potent, practically no attempt had been made before 1791 to fulfil this intention, notwithstanding the tenor of the Royal Instructions issued to Sir Guy and to other governors-in-chief.

The Instructions, which had been modelled on those in use in other colonies for generations past, showed that the British Government had continuously regarded the Church as established. The Quebec Act of 1774 afforded evidence that the idea of endowing the Church in Canada, as it had been endowed in the old English colonies, insular and continental, as well as in Nova Scotia, had not been abandoned. On the other hand, it restored to the Roman Catholic clergy "their accustomed Dues and Rights," which, pending the announcement of the King's pleasure, had remained in abeyance since the signing of the Capitulation of Montreal in September,

¹See sections 32 and 33 of Murray's Instruction in Short and Doughty's *Documents relating to the Constitutional History of Canada, 1759-1791*, p. 191.

²On Lord Dorchester and the Church of England see *Report of the Canadian Historical Association*, 1926, pp. 60-65.

1760, but "with respect to such persons only as shall profess the said Religion."

The wording of the paragraph immediately following this is highly significant: "Provided nevertheless, That it shall be lawful for His Majesty, His Heirs or Successors, to make such Provision out of the rest of the said accustomed Dues and Rights, for the encouragement of the Protestant Religion, and for the Maintenance and Support of a Protestant Clergy within the said Province, as he or they shall, from Time to Time, think necessary and expedient." In the language of 1774 "Protestant Religion" and "Protestant Clergy" had only one meaning, notwithstanding the establishment of Independency by law in New England and the assertion of religious and civil equality by Independent and Presbyterian pastors.³ They meant the Religion and the Clergy of the Church of England, and none other.

Inasmuch as this provision of the Quebec Act relating to "Dues and Rights," "Protestant Religion," "and Protestant Clergy," together with the Royal Instructions to Governors, forms the basis, so to speak, of the ecclesiastical sections of the Canada, or Constitutional, Act of 1791, it is important to remember the terms of those Instructions, which had been evolving and expanding since the earlier years of the seventeenth century. The form which they had assumed in 1787, on the appointment of Dr. Charles Inglis to be the first Bishop of Nova Scotia, and, incidentally the first Colonial Bishop of the Anglican Communion within the British Empire, is of immediate importance in connection with the present inquiry, for they were the latest to be issued to Lord Dorchester prior to the passing of the Canada, or Constitutional, Act.

The appointment of bishops for the colonies had been contemplated in Bishop Laud's time, and it had been on the

³See *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution*, by Alice M. Baldwin.

point of accomplishment immediately before the death of Queen Anne, who ever manifested a deep personal interest in the matter and in everything else pertaining to the general well-being of the Church of England. It had been seriously considered again in 1749, on the occasion of the application of the Moravian Brethren for the like privilege in America, and in 1763-1766, when the Roman Catholics in Canada were craving leave to fill the vacancy in the See of Quebec caused by the death, in 1760, of Bishop Pontbriand. In deference to the clamour raised by those men in the colonies (and at home) who asserted that they saw in the proposals an insidious plot to curtail the civil and the religious liberties of all who were outside the communion of the Church of England, it had been repeatedly neglected.

In 1784 the Government of Great Britain, through fear of offending the young United States, had hesitated to introduce legislation to make possible the consecration of Dr. Seabury as Bishop of Connecticut. That difficulty having been overcome, Parliament had at last authorized the Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1786, to consecrate bishops for service abroad—meaning the United States. Early in 1787 His Grace had made use of the permission thus given and had consecrated Bishops White and Provoost of Pennsylvania and New York. Almost of necessity, therefore, a bishop for Nova Scotia, for whom petition had been made almost contemporaneously, had to be conceded.

The Royal Mandamus for the consecration of Dr. Inglis was issued in much the same form as if he had been appointed for service in England, Ireland, or Wales. The Royal Letters Patent defined his powers and his privileges, but they expressly reserved to the Governor, the Lieutenant-Governor, or the person administering the Government for the time being, all those episcopal prerogatives which for a century and a half, or thereabouts, had inhered in the governors of colonies—granting

letters of probate and of administration, the issuance of marriage licenses, the presentation to, and the removal from, livings.

Dr. Inglis was paid in part by the British Treasury and in part by the S.P.G. from the proceeds of an old endowment, begun about a hundred and seventy years previously by a bequest of Archbishop Tenison for the payment of bishops in America. Till new arrangements should be made, the Bishop was to administer, in addition to his proper See, New Brunswick, Canada, Newfoundland, and, presently, Bermuda. Although he appears to have been addressed by courtesy as "My Lord Bishop" he was not legally entitled to be so styled till 1807, when he acquired the right by virtue of being summoned to the Council of Nova Scotia.

The presence of a bishop in the British American provinces rendered necessary the revision of the Instructions to the governor-in-chief. In their amended form of August 25th, 1787, they show the Bishop of London to have ceased to hold the right to exercise jurisdiction in British North America, which, although His Lordship's powers were now vested in the Bishop of Nova Scotia, still remained a part of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canterbury.

The Instructions ordained that "Fit Support and Countenance" were to be given to the Bishop "in the exercise of his Jurisdiction Spiritual and Ecclesiastical according to the Laws of this Realm, and the Laws of the Provinces under your Government." To the Bishop, or his Commissary, was reserved the right of instituting to benefices, although that of presentation and deprivation was continued to His Excellency together with the functions of the surrogate and the issuance of marriage licenses. His Excellency was still under obligation to see "that God Almighty be devoutly and duly served throughout" his Government; "that the Lord's Day be duly kept, and that the Services and Prayers appointed by, and

according to the Book of Common Prayer, be publicly and solemnly read and performed throughout the year." In addition to taking care that "the Churches which are or may be hereafter erected in Our said Provinces or Island under your Government, be well and orderly kept," there was an injunction "that besides a competent Maintenance to be assigned to the Minister of each Parish Church, a Convenient House be built at the Common Charge for each Minister." Recommendations were to be made "to the Legislative Council and General Assemblies of the Provinces under Your Government, to settle the Limits of Parishes, in such a manner as shall be deemed most convenient for accomplishing this good work." Every "Minister" (in their protestantism they then avoided the use of the word Priest) was to be constituted a member of the Vestry in his Parish and "no Vestry was to be held without him—"except in Case of Sickness, or after Notice given of a Vestry he omit to come."

With all this, Liberty of Conscience was to be permitted "and the free Exercise of all such Modes of Religious Worship, as are not prohibited by Law, to all Persons who inhabit and frequent the Provinces under your Government, provided they be contented with a quiet and peaceable enjoyment of the same, without giving Offence or Scandal to Government." This, doubtless, was intended to operate in favour of the Roman Catholics, who, notwithstanding the influx of Loyalists of various denominations, still formed the majority of the population of Canada.

To Legislative Councils or to Assemblies it was to be recommended "to make due Provision for the erecting and Maintaining of Schools, where youth may be educated in Competent Learning, and in Knowledge of the Principles of the Christian Religion." Schoolmasters were not to be allowed to keep school without first obtaining the Governor's license "In all Cases where the School has been founded, instituted or

appointed for the Education of Members of the Church of England, you are not to grant such Licenses except to Persons, who shall first have obtained from the Bishop of Nova Scotia, or one of his Commissaries, a Certificate of their being properly qualified for that Purpose." This differentiation of schools also was made in all probability because of Roman Catholic preponderance in the population.

Finally, His Excellency was required to take measures for the suppression of all manner of vice and to see to it that "the Constables and Church Wardens of the several Parishes do make presentment upon Oath, of any of the Vices before mentioned, to the Justices of the Peace in their Sessions or to any of the other Temporal Courts." He was to have effectual laws made for the "Restraint and Punishment" of the vices; and he was "to appoint no Person to be a Justice of the Peace, or to any Public Trust or Employment, whose notorious ill Life or Conversation may occasion Scandal." The mention of "Church Wardens," who were and are officials unknown to Presbyterian polity and organization, seems to show clearly that the British Government had contemplated the erection of the parishes into municipal units, a policy which, in spite of the seeming attempt at it contained in the legislature's Act of 1793, was never put into effect in Upper Canada, as it had been in the oldest English colonies.

To these new Instructions as a whole Lord Dorchester paid no more heed than he had paid to those which had preceded them at intervals after his first taking office in Canada in 1766, except that, in and after 1787-1788, he did set aside sites for churches and schools, together with glebes for parsons and schoolmasters in all the towns and townships as they were surveyed. So little encouragement in the matter of either schools or church affairs did His Excellency give to Bishop Inglis on the occasion of his only visitation of his Canadian

clergy, in August, 1789, that His Lordship⁴ left Quebec with the feeling that it was useless for him to return. He accordingly had little influence on the course of events in Upper Canada, which, apparently, he never saw.

The one thing of moment done at this juncture for Upper Canada was the appointment by the bishop of the Revd. John Stuart, United Empire Loyalist, of Kingston, to be his Commissary or Official, an office which he held also under the elder Mountain to the day of his death, August 15th, 1811, winning in the discharge of the duties the title of "Father of the Church in Upper Canada," and "Spiritual Father" of Bishop Strachan. Acting supposedly under instructions from his bishop, Stuart applied to the Executive Council of Upper Canada for recognition of his right, as Official, to issue marriage licenses; but the prayer of this petition the Honourable Council declined to grant after reference to the governor's Instructions and to the bishop's patent.

By this time the Canada, or Constitutional, Act of 1791 had been brought into operation. Colonel Simcoe's sensible, statesmanlike plea for the appointment of a bishop for Upper Canada apart from Lower Canada had been disregarded. In 1793 Dr. Jacob Mountain, a friend and sometime secretary to Mr. Pitt, received from the Crown the appointment to the See of Quebec with jurisdiction over both the Canadas, and, to the detriment of Upper Canada, he chose Quebec to be his See city and place of residence. On presenting his patent to Lord Dorchester, Mountain found, to his chagrin, that the Royal Mandamus ordering His Excellency to summon him to the Councils of the provinces, under sections 6 and 7 of the Constitutional Act, had not been enclosed with his other papers. This untoward failure to adhere to the letter of the promise which had undoubtedly been made to him was rectified after much correspondence; but it made a bad beginning, neverthe-

⁴See copy of his *Journal* in the Archives at Ottawa.

less, for the relations between bishop and governor-in-chief, which, apparently, worked out to the further disadvantage of the Church, for, shortly before his final return to England in 1796, Dorchester intimated to the Colonial Secretary that the bishop had gone into opposition.

For thirty-two years, unfortunately, Jacob Mountain was Bishop of Quebec, albeit he wished on several occasions to tender his resignation and to obtain some sort of preferment in England. The ground of his dissatisfaction is to be found chiefly in the fact that the Home Government would not take steps to have the Church established, would not erect Rectories, would not transfer to him the right of presentation to and removal from livings, and would not vest in him the power to grant letters testamentary, to issue marriage licenses, and to try cases of breach of ecclesiastical discipline.

For the University of Upper Canada, with the establishment of which Simcoe, considering the tenor of the Royal Instructions, had naturally charged him, he accomplished nothing. Indeed, he seems to have attempted nothing, preferring to concentrate his efforts upon bringing into existence, in 1801, the Royal Institution for the Advancement of Learning. He intended, apparently, to extend the Institution's operation to Upper Canada, although the Act creating it had been passed by the Legislature of Lower Canada only. By the Act he seems to have widened the cleavage between Roman Catholics and "Protestants," which Dorchester had sought to avoid in 1789 by means of his proposed secular university,—a cleavage which had been definitely made by Mountain's general behaviour and by his being summoned to the Executive and Legislative Councils, when that privilege was not accorded at the same time to the Roman Catholic bishop.

Mountain's attitude to the Clergy Reserves was summed up in the words: "Government may provide for the Church

of Scotland, if it will; but it shall not be done at the expense of the Church of England.” In that attitude he had the backing of the S.P.G., which, as already noted, was the chief ruler of the Church in Canada. The Government to which Mountain referred in that connection was, of course, the Home Government, for the Imperial Parliament alone at this period had the power to authorize the alienation of lands or the allocation of moneys for such purposes. Approval from Home had likewise to be obtained for legislation in regard to religious matters introduced into and passed by Colonial Legislatures.⁵

There is abundance of evidence to show that Mountain was more concerned with questions of precedence in Council, display at levees, personal and family aggrandizement, and political intrigues than he was with the advancement of the spiritual interests of the backwoods settlers committed to his care. Over against Sir John Sherbrooke’s remark that he “inclined more to politics than to theology,” is to be set, however, his kindness to his clergy, to which the letters of several of them bear testimony.

Fancying himself in the rôle of a diplomat and making accordingly unduly long sojourns in England, Mountain was not aware, till he received the news from Canada, that, before his very eyes as it were, the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Canada had been able in 1819 to obtain very important concessions from the Imperial Government, while he, with all his endeavours, had made no progress whatsoever toward the attainment of his own objective. To render that situation still more galling for him, he received from the Colonial Office the same intimation that he had received upon a former occasion—that he had better return to Canada at once in order to give to his diocese that oversight of which it must surely stand very much in need.

Three years earlier Strachan, then recently appointed an

⁵See Sections 41 and 42 of the *Canada, or Constitutional, Act*.

honorary member of the Executive Council of Upper Canada, had managed to convince Mountain that it would be vain to hope to induce the Provincial House of Assembly to consent to the establishment of Rectories unless a specific declaration was made that no right to the collection of tithes or other like civil implication was to be associated with them. Such a declaration was accordingly made. At a date earlier, Strachan had suggested that, in order to make up for the scarcity of clergy, schoolmasters should be allowed to read the Church service and approved sermons on Sundays in their school-houses, in places where there were no churches. For a number of years this most sensible suggestion was disregarded, being too great a novelty.

At the close of the War of 1812, Strachan had offered to educate without remuneration, as he was ever ready to do, promising young men for the ministry, because of the difficulty of tempting suitable ordained men to leave the Old Country and to accept the small stipends which the Government and the Venerable Society combined could afford to pay. Out of this generous offer grew a system of scholarships or bursaries, which for thirty or forty years enabled successive generations of young men to subsist till their course of training could be completed.

In 1813 the Imperial Government, which had set a precedent as early as 1785 in the case of John Stuart already mentioned, and, more recently, in the case of other clergymen, became responsible, jointly with the Society, for the payment of the salaries of all Anglican missionaries, the Society being the intermediary through whom the payments were made. The reason for the adoption of this policy, which continued in force down to 1833, or a little later, was the unproductiveness of the Clergy Reserves; but at no time does the ordinary clergyman appear to have benefited to the extent of more than £200 sterling per annum.

Slackness in the collection of rents by Sheriffs of Districts, to whom this business had been at first entrusted, was one cause of the unproductiveness of these reserved lands. Another was the reluctance of incoming settlers to lease or to purchase lands when they could obtain grants from government on payment of comparatively small fees. To conserve the clergy sevenths, on which in some instances squatters had cast longing eyes, Mountain caused a Clergy Corporation to be formed in each province, Strachan becoming chairman of the one in Upper Canada. Thus he attained an official standing in the scheme of things in spite of Mountain's successor, Stewart, and the co-worker of the latter, Sir John Colborne. Even so, he was of necessity subject to his bishop, especially when the latter became resident at York, as Stewart ultimately did.

The one outstanding benefit which Mountain had conferred upon the Church in the Canadas was the appointment of the Revd. the Hon. Charles James Stewart, to be Visiting Missionary for the diocese in the year 1819. This redounded to the advantage of Upper Canada in particular, for Dr. Stewart perceived that there the greatest need existed and that there lay the greatest hope for building up a strong "Protestant" Church. Through his family connections, his wide circle of friends, and his own great zeal and wisdom, he was able to secure large sums of money for the purpose of paying more missionaries and of building churches and parsonages. He was able also to induce no inconsiderable number of men to come out from the Old Country to minister among the new and the older settlers, both classes of whom he himself visited unweariedly on foot, on horseback, by wagon, or by boat, throughout the long space of seventeen years.

During ten of these years Stewart was himself Bishop of Quebec. Unlike his predecessor, whose dignity had been offended at even the thought of being requested to baptize,

marry, or bury members of common soldiers' families, Stewart gloried in the greater opportunities thus afforded him for prosecuting the great work to which he had first dedicated himself in 1807. On his promotion, he devoted much the greater portion of his time and strength to Upper Canada, even though he had there two Archdeacons, Strachan of York and George Okill Stuart of Kingston, both of whom had been nominated by him but appointed and paid by the Imperial Government. Permission for their appointment had been given only after the Colonial Office had made full enquiry into the institution and all the implications of the office, as already established in India.

There was in the province one travelling missionary or more. As to travelling missionaries, in which light all the clergy of Upper Canada always regarded themselves, in spite of Sir John Colborne's over-hasty strictures, a curious misapprehension has at times arisen. Sir John, who was too intimately acquainted with Bishop Stewart and with his work⁶ not to know that he already had such men working under him, has been made to appear as recommending that they be appointed for the first time. As a matter of fact, Sir John wanted to see them increased, as he plainly said, to two in every township for the purpose of better counteracting the influence of the Methodists.

By Methodists, including the late distinguished Chancellor Burwash, Sir John has been somewhat too severely criticized on account of his unwillingness at first to countenance the erection of the Upper Canada Academy into a university. Examination of the correspondence shows that Sir John's views on the subject were based upon the conviction that the cure for the evil of which the Methodists complained was not to multiply denominational universities but to take away from

⁶See *Papers and Records* of the Ontario Historical Society. Vol. XXV, pp. 438-449.

King's College its exclusively Anglican character so that members of all communions might attend it without doing violence to their consciences. In those views most men of the present day will concur, to the vindication of Sir John, even while they freely admit that the Academy, under the style of the University of Victoria College, amply justified its existence both before and after its federation with the University of Toronto.

The institution of Sir John's own founding, Upper Canada College, was also denominated an Anglican institution by the late Chancellor in his posthumous book on the University of Victoria College, although it has never been such at any period of its existence of a hundred years. It was founded on a comprehensive Christian basis, despite the fact that most of its early masters were (almost of necessity) Anglicans and some of them clergymen. Yet it never was Anglican in its government, for it was placed under the direction of the Council of King's College only after the passing of the amending Act of 1837, by which the Provincial Legislature made those very changes in the Royal Charter for which Sir John had contended in vain throughout the whole period of his tenure of the lieutenant-governorship, 1828-1836.

Now that the dust of the conflict has cleared away, it must be admitted by any impartial investigator that, under the leadership of the Ryersons, the Methodists executed in 1824-1828 a very clever tactical movement in order to avoid being taxed with subjection to American influence, which was one ground of objection Sir John and other men before and after his time had against them.⁷ The Methodists claimed that they had been born and bred such and that they were "also prior to the Church of England or of Scotland in respect to the period of their labours and actual existence in the Colony."

⁷The description of this movement as given by Egerton Ryerson can be found on pages 42-43 of the Report of the Dominion Archivist for the year 1899.

As a matter of fact, Bishop James Richardson, one of the signatories of one of the documents in which these claims were set out, had, like the Ryersons and many others, been born, baptized, and brought up in the Church of England, his father having been a subscriber to the building fund of the first St. George's Church, Kingston, and a churchwarden there four times between 1790 and 1796.⁸

In England, down to the date of John Wesley's death, the Methodists still regarded themselves as only a Society within the Church. In the United States, whence, as Egerton Ryerson stated, "the first Itinerant Ministers visited the province in about the year 1790 or 1791," as against Richardson's and Case's "priority of existence," the first Methodist bishops dated from 1784. In 1784, there were certainly Presbyterians, Anglicans, and Lutherans in what was to become Upper Canada, but just as certainly there seems not to have been any Methodist organization of even the most rudimentary kind. In 1791 there were already two Anglican missionaries, Stuart and Langhorn.

The Methodists played their political game skilfully; and they played it successfully. It may perhaps be a good thing that, after the Church of Scotland and the Methodists themselves had been permitted to have a share in it, the Legislature of United Canada was allowed by the Imperial Government to confiscate the endowment bestowed upon the Church of England. Yet the fact remains that what the two Mountains, Stewart, and Strachan had contended for, was nothing more and nothing less than what had been legally bestowed upon the Church by the only authority competent legally to bestow it—the Imperial Parliament. It would be interesting, on the other hand, to estimate the influence of Mr. James Stephen of the Colonial Office in producing the result desired by non-

⁸See *The Parish Register of Kingston, Upper Canada*, 1785-1811.

Anglicans, for his evidence before the Commons' Committee of 1828 was far from acceptable to Stewart.

In only two instances did the legislature of Upper Canada attempt, before passing out of existence in 1841, to use its power in the direction of even appearing to confer upon the Church the character of an Establishment. The first was in 1793, when it provided for the election at annual Town Meetings of municipal officers, one of whom was to be known as Town and Church Warden. The second was when, as a result of Simcoe's manœuvres, it vested in the clergy of the Church the sole right to solemnize marriages, ministers of other communions being placed under obligation to obtain licenses for that purpose from the Justices of the Peace in their Quarter Sessions assembled.

The former of these Acts, which remained in force for fifty years or thereabouts, appears to have created no difficulty such as had arisen in Virginia, where an oath of conformity was required and was, apparently, taken frequently *pro forma*, without any qualms of conscience, by all sorts and conditions of men. Offences against the provisions of the second Act, which was presently amended in favour of the Church of Scotland, appear to have been winked at by even the lieutenant-governor. On this point a very outspoken letter complaining of his dereliction of duty was addressed to the Hon. Francis Gore by the Revd. John Langhorn, of Ernesttown and Fredericksburg, on January 4th, 1811.⁹

As to the Rectories, Sir John Colborne did indeed tell the Executive Council that he was about to establish them, but he can hardly be said to have taken the Council's advice. Notwithstanding his reference to it of Dr. Stewart's letter on the support of the clergy of Upper Canada, he was not habitually given to consulting it,¹⁰ as witness, for instance, the foundation

⁹See Vol. XXIII of *Papers and Records of the Ontario Historical Society*, pp. 557-558.

¹⁰See QUEEN'S QUARTERLY for April, May, June, 1928,

of Upper Canada College without regard to the Council. Having been instructed by the Colonial Office to take action toward establishing the Rectories, he was ready to do so, Bishop Stewart being privy to the matter.

No new lands seem to have been granted in connection with the Rectories in 1836, title and lawful possession merely being given to the old allotments made in 1788 and subsequent years. Thus they came well within the limits prescribed by the Canada, or Constitutional, Act; and even the clergy sevenths appear not to have come into consideration. The fact that the patronage was vested in the governor or the lieutenant-governor for the time being was fully in consonance with the Instructions to Governors issued regularly before and after 1763, and likewise with the provisions of the Canada Act. As no municipal powers or privileges were conferred, nor any right to collect tithes, the Rectories tended in no sense to establish the Church or to infringe upon the civil or the religious privileges of other communions.

In the margin of Bishop George J. Mountain's Report on the State of the Church in the two provinces, which was prepared for Lord Durham, His Excellency's annotations in his own handwriting, which are preserved at Ottawa, demonstrate fully the fact that Lord Durham did not regard the Church as established, though the Bishop did and though other persons commonly spoke of it as such. When, therefore, the Diocese of Toronto was created as one of the results of the Durham Report, Archdeacon Strachan had to be content to accept without a government salary the Queen's appointment to be the first bishop of the See; and he had, moreover, to pay out of his own pocket the heavy fees on the patent and on the other official documents, which had, apparently, been remitted to former bishops.

Being fully aware of his legal rights, Strachan was quite justified under the Canada Act in having recourse to London

when any enactments of the Provincial Legislature touching the Church were sent home for approval. He had good reason to hope that the Act passed by the Imperial Parliament in the session of 1840-1841 would be a final settlement of the dispute over the Reserves; but, being the practical politician that he was, he foresaw clearly the mischief that could be wrought for the Church under the Act of Union of 1840. Therefore he caused his dissent to its passing to be entered on the Journals of the Legislative Council of the province, of which he had been a member for a score of years or more.

To narrate in detail the statesmanlike achievements of Strachan as first Bishop of Toronto does not fall within the dates set as the limits of this article. Yet it is permissible to remark that he saved from the wreckage of the Reserves a Commutation Fund, which still exists for the benefit of the clergy of five out of six of the dioceses into which his own has been subdivided. Of three dioceses among the six he himself procured the establishment, seeing to it that they set out upon their several careers with sufficient endowments, subscribed in large part by members of his own communion within the province itself. Almost at the same time he secured endowments and a building fund for the University of Trinity College, "the child of the Church's adversity," which, free from all political control, was to continue to work out his ideal of the combination of religious with secular learning, the realization of which had been frustrated for the moment by the legislature's Act of 1849 secularizing King's College. In 1857 he met with courage the final withdrawal of the Venerable Society's contributions toward the support of the clergy in his own diocese. In the same year he saw passed the legislation which rendered secure that democratic institution, the diocesan synod with lay as well as clerical representation of the parishes, the long fight for which he had initiated and prosecuted to a successful issue. Ten years later, in the

January next preceding his death, as presiding bishop, he took part in the consecration of the first Canadian bishop to be consecrated without the Queen's Mandamus. Thus was attained at last the completion of the separation of the Church from the State, seventy-six years after its endowment under the terms of the Canada, or Constitutional, Act and thirteen years after its partial disendowment by the legislature. A remarkable coincidence it is that the final acknowledgment of the right of the Church to govern itself without reference to any authority in London should have been made in the same year in which the confederation of the four original provinces of the Dominion was accomplished, after a period of turmoil and bitterness of feeling similar to that through which the Church had come. Thus happily for both Church and State was completed the evolution of self-government.

THE KYOTO CONFERENCE

BY LAWRENCE J. BURPEE

NOTHING is more significant of Canada's emergence from the period of childhood to that of manhood than her attitude toward international affairs. It is not so very long ago that foreign problems lay for the most part entirely outside the field of vision of the average Canadian who could not see, generally speaking, that they touched his interests in any way. His mind was preoccupied with domestic matters, and if his eye ever roamed beyond the boundaries of the Dominion it was merely to note the curious fact that in many respects certain parts of the outside world were slow to realize the advantages of his way of living. Though he would have indignantly denied the charge, the average Canadian's outlook was provincial, if not parochial; he preferred—this, too, he would not have admitted—to leave the conduct of foreign affairs to the Mother Country, which had developed the seemingly uncomfortable habit of meddling in these remote and generally unremunerative matters.

The Great War did much to shatter this complacent point of view. Thousands of Canadians rubbed shoulders with men of other tongues and other ways; found that it did not necessarily follow that a different way was an inferior way; that these men passed the acid test of the trenches as well as they did, and, indeed, that under the skin they were all brothers. Some of them came home after the War and spread the leaven. Canadians commenced to realize that no country in this modern world could shut itself up in a water-tight compartment and escape its responsibility to the outside world. And as soon as this idea took root it began to germinate; its fruits are seen in the history of the last decade. Canadians took an

active part in the negotiations that led to the Treaties of Peace; her representatives signed the Treaties; she has taken her part in the manifold activities of the League of Nations and its various subordinate bodies, and is now a member of the Council of the League; she has adhered to the Briand-Kellogg Pact; she has exchanged Ministers with the United States, France and Japan. In these and many other ways Canada has proved her increasing interest in world affairs, and her realization of the fact that she is now a full-fledged member of the Commonwealth of Nations, with all the responsibilities of such membership. With such an immediate background, it is not surprising that Canadians should have taken part in the Honolulu meeting of the Institute of Pacific Relations in 1927, and that the Dominion should have been even more fully represented at the 1929 meeting of the same Institute in Kyoto, Japan.

The Institute of Pacific Relations is one of the numerous international agencies that have come into being since the close of the Great War. Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, Director of the Institute of International Education, has explained briefly and clearly the origin and history of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

“In 1925,” he says, “some public-spirited Americans, disturbed because of the resentment in Japan resulting from the passage of the Immigration Act of 1924 and because of the growing anti-foreign sentiment in China, suggested holding a conference at Honolulu of unofficial representatives from Australia, New Zealand, China, Japan, Canada, and the United States. Representatives of all shades of opinion in those countries met and discussed in the frankest manner the great problems that endangered the peace of the Pacific area. Before closing its sessions, which were characterized by a sympathetic regard upon the part of the representatives of one country for the difficulties of the peoples of other

countries, the conference established the Institute of Pacific Relations, whose headquarters were to be in Honolulu. Moreover, in each of the countries represented there was founded a National Council which represents the Institute in that country. A second conference was held at the same place in the summer of 1927, to which representatives of the Philippines, Korea, and Great Britain were also invited. Its discussions were of such value as to win the heartiest approval of the press as well as of the intellectual classes of all the countries concerned. The Institute and its National Councils are voluntary organizations without governmental connections, and are supported entirely by voluntary subscriptions. . . . Because of the unofficial character of the conference and its members, the discussions are frank, objective and illuminating. Moreover, the personal contacts made by the representative men and women who attend are of the greatest value in developing the international understanding upon which international goodwill depends. The conference adopts no resolutions concerning the problems discussed, and relies upon the personal influence of the members to help educate public opinion at home as to the real nature of the issues involved in those problems. In the interim between the biennial meetings it appoints individual scholars or committees to investigate aspects of problems which discussion showed needed further research."

One can readily see the unusual nature of this body. It rests in no sense upon governments, and has nothing to do with their policies. It is rather an expression of the genius of the English-speaking peoples for furthering public reforms through private agencies. One Japanese expressed rather aptly the attitude of his countrymen towards it when he said, "We Japanese are interested in this Institute because it comes with nothing to sell, nothing to teach and nothing to preach, in short, nothing to put over on the Far West." And its methods

are as unusual as its nature. Formal papers are prepared for its meetings, but are not read there. They are sent in months ahead of the conference, and are distributed in printed or mimeographed form to the delegates before they meet. As soon as the conference opens, it is broken up into a series of round tables, consisting of members of each of the national groups, with a chairman and one or more recorders. The round tables, to which only delegates and observers are admitted, have the mornings and afternoons, the evenings being devoted to an open forum, to which the public and press are invited. Here one or two speakers attempt to summarize the results of the day's discussions, and others from the floor discuss their conclusions.

Some one asked the other day if the Pacific Relations which constituted the field of the Institute's activities were to be understood geographically or ethically. I think one might say, both geographically and ethically; the purpose of the Institute being to help create conditions that will make for peace in the Pacific, with all that that implies in mutual understanding, respect and goodwill. One thing the Institute distinctly does not propose to do is to encourage in any way the domination of the Pacific area by any one culture. As Mr. J. Merle Davis said, at the opening session of the Kyoto Conference, "It is reasonable to look upon the differences in philosophy, in temperament, in social customs and aesthetic values as priceless sources of enrichment to the life of the neighbourhood. The Institute of Pacific Relations does not propose to iron out those differences but rather to make the contribution of each available and serviceable to all. It believes that two types of culture developing separately for ages and having at last met are each essential to the other if each is to present a balanced and stable entity. The force, practicality, impetuosity and individualism of the West can well be supplemented by the elements of self-control, dignity, aesthetic

appreciation and social solidarity of the East. Both civilizations contain within themselves the seeds of decay, but each has the possibility of providing for the other an antidote for this decay."

Canada's interest in the Pacific, and in the other peoples whose coasts are washed by its waters, is no new thing, neither is it a matter of small importance. Without going back to prehistoric times, and the now generally accepted theory that the remote ancestors of our Indians came from Asia by way of the Aleutians, the earliest beginnings of British settlement on the Pacific Coast are associated with the shipment of sea-otter skins from that coast to China. To-day our trade with China and Japan, while not so romantic, is much more extensive and profitable. From a statement prepared by the Dominion Statistician it appears that in the last ten years Canada's trade with China has increased from less than \$5,000,000 to more than \$27,000,000, and with Japan from \$26,000,000 to \$55,000,000. We buy mainly from China nuts, eggs and furs, and from Japan silk, tea, chinaware and oranges. We sell to the former wheat and flour, and to the latter wheat, lumber, fish, lead and zinc.

In other respects our relations with the peoples of these two countries have been not so satisfactory. The story of the migration of Japanese and Chinese to British Columbia is one of almost constant friction and irritation. In the early days of the province, when labour was scarce and the country was clamouring for the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway and other public works, Chinese coolies were welcomed. Later, however, when these people flocked into the towns, and were reinforced by shiploads of both Chinese and Japanese immigrants, who with their different standards of living and capacity for hard work were able to compete on very unequal terms with white labour, the demand grew ever more insistent for the restriction and finally for the total prohibition of

Oriental immigration to Canada. This competition was actually more serious in the case of the Japanese than the Chinese, who were content, in many cases, with occupations which did not appeal to white labour, while the alert and aggressive Japanese were prepared to turn their hand to any occupation that offered. Legislation was repeatedly introduced in the British Columbia Assembly designed to restrict the field of Oriental competition, only to be disallowed by the Dominion Government as the result of protests from abroad. The situation resolved itself into a vicious and irritating circle: anti-oriental legislation in British Columbia; protests from Japanese and Chinese to their home governments; representations from those governments to London; suggestions from the British government to Ottawa; disallowance by the Dominion government of the provincial acts; and the introduction of new legislation at Victoria.

Eventually the Dominion government became convinced that something must be done. A Commission was appointed in 1884 to investigate the problem of Chinese immigration, and as a result of its report a head tax of \$50 was imposed. This remedy did not prove effective, and, following the report of another Commission appointed in 1902, the head tax was increased to \$500. This regulation also proved ineffective; the Canadian government then attempted to arrive at an agreement with the Chinese government by which China would herself regulate the emigration of her people to Canada. These negotiations fell through because of the fall of the Manchu Dynasty. In 1923 the Chinese Immigration Act was passed, which definitely prevents the entry into Canada of persons of Chinese origin other than government representatives, Chinese children born in Canada, merchants and students, the two latter classes to carry passports issued by the Government of China and endorsed by a Canadian Immigration Officer.

The history of Japanese immigration has been somewhat

different, mainly because the position and influence of the Japanese government during the last few decades have been very different from those of China. In 1900 the Japanese government, as the result of ill-feeling in British Columbia, prohibited entirely for the time being the emigration of Japanese labourers to Canada. A few years later this prohibition was lifted, and the Japanese came pouring into British Columbia. Feeling became so bitter in that province that Mr. Rodolphe Lemieux was sent to Japan in 1907 to negotiate an agreement with the government of Japan, by which the passports issued to Japanese desiring to emigrate to Canada would be restricted to certain classes and numbers. Supplementary agreements of 1923 and 1928 put further restrictions upon Japanese immigration. The total Japanese immigration to Canada is now limited to 150 annually, including the wives and children of Japanese resident in Canada. There are now approximately 40,000 Chinese in Canada—one-half of them are settled in British Columbia—and 16,000 Japanese, nearly all of whom are in that province.

In case one is inclined to charge the people of British Columbia with intolerance, selfishness and narrow-mindedness, it is fair to remember that the total population of that province is less than 600,000; that it lies nearer to Japan and China than any other part of either Canada or the United States; and that the Japanese, in particular, have to a large extent brought their wives with them, and are producing large families. To suggest the possibilities of such a situation, it may be remembered that at the time immigration from France to Canada ceased there were about 10,000 French people in this country—considerably less than the present number of Japanese in British Columbia. By purely natural increase the number of French-Canadians has grown to 3,500,000, including about a million in the United States. Even though no more Japanese were admitted to British Columbia, it is not

difficult to calculate their formidable numbers fifty or a hundred years hence.

Among the delegates who assembled at Kyoto there was at the outset a good deal of anxiety lest what should begin as a perfectly amicable round table might develop into a series of recriminations and perhaps end in the wrecking of the Institute; and there were not wanting grounds for such a fear. The Institute had, it is true, navigated safely through the two meetings at Honolulu, but the discussion of more or less academic questions in such a Lotus Land as Hawaii was very different to debating, in the heart of Japan, problems that were loaded with gunpowder, and that to many of the delegates involved matters of national sovereignty, national honour, and safety. Nor was the situation helped by the fact that the Chinese rather tactlessly brought forward at the opening meeting of the Conference one or two matters that had already caused a great deal of ill-feeling between China and Japan, and that were much better forgotten. The quick wit and firmness of the chairman, fortunately, found a safe way out of what might have become a dangerous situation. Looking back at the Kyoto meeting, one realizes that it was a very daring experiment. That it should have been a success under such conditions as obtained at Honolulu would have been no matter for surprise, but that it should have come triumphantly through the very different atmosphere of Kyoto was something for whole-hearted congratulation. It convinced all of us that the Institute of Pacific Relations had come to stay.

The roll-call at Kyoto disclosed the fact that there were nearly two hundred delegates and observers, in addition to the Institute Secretariat, the secretaries of national groups, and members of the families of delegates. The largest group came naturally from Japan, which was host to the Institute; the United States was a close second; Canada sent twenty-nine; China thirty-one; Great Britain fifteen; Australia eleven;

New Zealand seven; the Philippines eight; six from Hawaii were included in the American group; and there was an equal number from Korea. The observers included two from the League of Nations, three from the International Labour Office, two from Russia, and one each from France, Mexico, and the Netherlands. A noticeable circumstance was the fact that the various groups included some thirty women, who took an active part in the discussion of various questions at the round tables.

Looking over the list of names, and remembering what one learned from day to day of their personalities as revealed in discussions at the round tables and in conversation in the lobbies, one is impressed with the fact that, whether by design or accident, the various countries managed to send a very able and representative group of delegates. This is more significant in that in no case did the government of any of the countries have anything to do with the selection or sending of the delegates. Nor did any delegate go to Kyoto charged to represent the views of any organization, governmental or otherwise; his sole responsibility was to use his own best judgment, in co-operation with other delegates, in digging down to the roots of the various problems on the agenda, and exploring practicable solutions.

It may, perhaps, be said that the outstanding figures in the British group were Viscount Hailsham, formerly Lord Chancellor; Lionel Curtis, once editor of the *Round Table*; A. J. Toynbee, Research Professor of International History at the University of London; Canon Streeter of Oxford; Dame Littleton; and Hardy Jowett, of the Asiatic Petroleum Company, Peking. Among the Americans, in addition to their chairman Jerome D. Greene, of Lee, Higginson and Company, one should mention particularly Dr. James T. Shotwell of Columbia, Roland W. Boyden, formerly United States Observer with the Reparations Commission;

George H. Blakeslee of Clark University; Frederick P. Keppel, president of the Carnegie Corporation, and Sterling Fessenden, Director General of the Municipal Council of Shanghai. Leaders of the Japanese group were Dr. Inazo Nitobe, formerly Under-Secretary General of the League of Nations, and Chairman of the Kyoto Conference, Masanao Hanihara, sometime Ambassador to the United States, and Yosuke Matsuoka, formerly Vice-President of the South Manchurian Railway; of the Chinese, Dr. David Z. T. Yui of Shanghai; Chang Po-ling, president of Nankai University, Tientsin, and C. F. Wang, General Manager of the Fengtien Mining Administration at Mukden; of Australia, F. W. Eggleston, late Attorney General and Minister of Railways of Victoria, and A. H. Charteris, Professor of International Law at the University of Sydney; of New Zealand, W. B. Matheson, who represented his government at the International Agricultural Conference at Rome, and Dr. H. B. Bolshaw, Professor of Economics at Auckland University.

Canada was very ably led by the Hon. N. W. Rowell, with John Nelson, of the Sun Life Assurance Company, as Secretary of the Group; the universities were represented by George M. Wrong of Toronto, Dr. E. N. Best of Montreal, John A. MacKay of Winnipeg, and H. F. Angus of Vancouver; the Canadian press by Horace Hunter, D. A. McGregor and Mark Nichols; labour interests by Tom Moore; business by F. B. McCurdy of Halifax, Gerald Birks of Montreal, Sir John Aird of Toronto, E. J. Tarr of Winnipeg, and George Kidd of Vancouver.

The principal subjects discussed at the various round tables were the fate of Manchuria; the status of Shanghai; Extra-territoriality; Foreign Concessions and Settlements in China; Food and Population, which involved the vexed question of emigration; Diplomatic relations in the Pacific, and Finance. Of these, probably most time was given to the very

involved Manchurian problem, with its reactions upon the political and economic life of China, Japan, Korea and Russia. Toward the preliminary elucidation of these and other questions members of the various groups contributed something over one hundred books, pamphlets and special papers. Perhaps the most noteworthy of these was the series of printed studies prepared by a group of Japanese experts on behalf of the Japanese Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations, under the general title "Western Influences in Modern Japan." In these twenty-one little volumes are included monographs on Exotic Currents in Japanese Civilization; European and American Influences in Japanese Education; a Survey of Philosophy in Japan; Reception and Influence of Occidental Legal Ideas in Japan.

It was a most interesting experience to sit at one of the round tables at Kyoto, with perhaps a scholarly Chinaman on one side and an astute and well-informed Japanese on the other, and to follow the course of discussion, question and answer, comment and retort, nearly always courteous and good-natured, although the subjects considered were often extremely delicate in character. Those of us who came from English-speaking countries did not, I think, always realize the handicap under which our friends from Japan and China laboured. English was the language of the conference, and it must have been a severe strain to carry on a discussion of doubtful points in difficult questions, particularly when it was important to phrase what had to be said rather carefully. That they succeeded in doing so, and were able to hold their own in debate with the majority of the delegates, to whom English was the mother tongue, is a tribute to the calibre of the men who represented China and Japan at Kyoto.

It might readily be supposed that the Canadian delegates would have little to contribute from their personal and national experience to the discussion of such problems as that

of Manchuria and yet it appeared that there were points of similarity if not of contact. During the course of the debate one of the Japanese defended very ably the policy of his country in maintaining troops in Manchuria. This was necessary, he argued, to protect the railway and other interests of Japan in Manchuria, upon which she had expended many millions of yen. "That may be so," replied one of the Chinese, "nevertheless the United States, has invested far more in Canada than Japan has in Manchuria, yet one never hears it suggested that she should maintain there a standing army to protect those interests." It might, of course, have been pointed out that conditions in Canada were somewhat different from conditions in Manchuria.

On another occasion one of the Chinese put forward the idea that it might be practicable for his country and Japan to iron out their differences in regard to Manchuria by the establishment of some such tribunal as the International Joint Commission, which Canada and the United States had found effective in disposing of matters of dispute between those two countries. It was an illustration of the fact that sometimes we do not appreciate the true value of the things we possess, until it is shown by others, that this North American experiment, which has been in successful operation for eighteen years, and which had won the enthusiastic approval of a Chinese statesman, had never yet even come to the knowledge of an eminent American professor of international law who at the Conference had shown himself thoroughly familiar with the intricacies of the Manchurian problem.

In an address at the opening meeting Mr. Merle Davis, of the United States Group, reminded his hearers that the question of the "concrete accomplishments" of the Institute of Pacific Relations was often raised. "The answer," he said, "is qualified by the definition of the term 'accomplishment', and depends, likewise, on the conception of the purpose of the

Institute. If it is conceived to be a mechanism devised solely for the immediate settlement of international disputes and the speedy solution of questions of inter-racial tension, its results may be disappointing. Even on this score, however, the unofficial discussions at Honolulu have furnished the sort of added light needed by one government in deciding to modify its policies with regard to another power of the Pacific area."

"If on the other hand," he said, "the Institute of Pacific Relations is conceived as a device for the study and discussion of the underlying factors that condition the harmonious adjustment of the peoples of the Pacific to one another, and for the furthering of a better understanding, a deeper respect and livelier goodwill toward each other of these people—in short, if the Institute of Pacific Relations is engaged in meeting the fundamental issues of the Pacific area and is taking the long look and the objective attitude born of the long look, then the seeker of concrete results will not be disappointed, although only the foundations of the structure have been laid. The fact that after four years and two biennial conferences the members of the Institute team are still harmoniously pulling together in spite of such formidable obstacles as the greatest of oceans rolling between them, language differences and various interpretations of the common task, is in itself an achievement that gives promise for greater service."

The Institute of Pacific Relations opened its third conference under very doubtful auspices. The Chinese and Japanese found it hard to forget the affront put upon their dignity by the government of the United States; the Chinese had a grievance against the British because of their refusal to surrender Shanghai and the other concessions and settlements, and to abandon extra-territoriality until China had put her house in order; the Chinese despised the Koreans, and both detested the Japanese; both China and Japan had minor grievances against Canada because of the immigration situa-

tion; some of the delegates from the Philippines and Korea were extreme nationalists; the Russians held aloof from everyone.

The delegates could scarcely fail to be influenced more or less by these grievances and prejudices; one trembled when one thought of the character of the questions they were expected to discuss with frankness, but in good temper. And yet that is just what they succeeded in doing. For about ten days Japanese and Chinese, British and Americans, Canadians and Australians, New Zealanders and Russians, French, Dutch and Koreans met together and discussed more or less burning questions around a table, in the smoking room, or at lunch; they found gradually that they had a great deal in common, and that, while they might at the outset look upon one another with distrust and suspicion, as the days went by these clouds became dissipated by the invigorating winds of mutual understanding. It is beyond question that most if not all the delegates returned to their respective countries with a clearer understanding of the problems of the Pacific, and with a better and more sympathetic knowledge of the character and point of view of the men and women of other tongues and other races who share in that great heritage. Nor does it seem too much to hope that this wider outlook may in time spread like a leaven throughout the lands of the Pacific. If the Institute of Pacific Relations contributes even a little toward that end, it will have justified its existence.

Now it is fairly obvious that a couple of hundred statesmen, college professors, bankers and men of business, representing more than a dozen different countries, did not go all the way to Kyoto—many of them had to travel half round the world to get there—merely to exchange amiable platitudes and drink the excellent tea of Japan. There was a serious purpose behind the Kyoto meeting. These were men of large views, capable of seeing beyond provincial or even national

horizons. They knew that to-day, more than ever before, nations were interdependent; that no country was really self-contained. They also knew that the international centre of gravity was moving toward the west, and that the time must come when the Pacific would overtake the Atlantic as a factor in world affairs. It seemed worth while, therefore, that the countries facing upon the Pacific, and particularly those most directly concerned, that is to say, the United States and Canada on one side and Japan and China on the other, should get together, if only in a strictly unofficial and informal way, and see if a better job might not be made of international relations on the Pacific than had been achieved in the Atlantic area. Because the relations between America and Asia are comparatively simple and recent, while those of America and Europe are old and involved, it might prove more particular to reach common ground. At any rate, the experiment appeared worth trying. It would be idle to expect immediate results, but the Institute of Pacific Relations will continue to operate, not only at its biennial conferences but throughout the intervening periods, by research work and special studies on both sides of the Pacific, and eventually something worth while will come out of it.

Turning from the general to the particular, what does the Kyoto meeting mean to Canada? It is not difficult to show that, although it might not always appear on the surface, Canada had a direct interest in every question discussed at Kyoto. For instance, she is concerned in the abolition of extra-territoriality because she has missionaries in the interior of China; in the cession of Shanghai to China because a considerable and growing part of her trade goes through that port, and she has other interests there; the same considerations apply in a minor degree to other foreign concessions or settlements the return of which is being demanded by China; the possibility of Japan finding a home for her surplus population in Manchuria is of very real concern to Canada, because it

would mean the permanent solution of the problem of Japanese emigration to Canada, a problem which has in it the seeds of very serious trouble. But after all, the one question between Canada and the Orient that to-day overshadows all others is that of trade. Canada has in China and Japan a market the enormous extent of which she is only beginning to realize. Her trade across the Pacific has grown rapidly in the last few years, but so far she has only touched the outer fringe. China and Japan are capable of absorbing a tonnage of Canadian foodstuffs and raw materials far in excess of our present exports to Europe. Such meetings as that at Kyoto in 1929, and the Peiping Conference of 1931, may easily be the lubricant that is needed to speed up the wheels of trade.

I cannot more appropriately close this article than by quoting a few words from the admirable address by Dr. Nitobe, the learned and broad-minded Chairman of the Conference: "What the world needs most of all is for the East and West to know one another, not in the spirit of antagonism, but with a will to conciliation, co-operation and friendship. Plato speaks of the first human being as 'global' and ever since he was split in two, a victim of divine wrath at his pride, the two halves have never been satisfied, the one in constant search of the other. By the union of both does each reach perfection. The East seeks the West, and the West will find something to learn from the East. There are problems which western science will never solve and which eastern intuition can unravel. There are heights in human emotions that transcend the limits of Plato's intellect, but that are familiar to the mind of Sakya Muni—depths in the human soul little fathomed by Spinoza and Leibnitz and yet probed by Laotze and Wang Yan Ming—beauties in nature hidden from the eyes of Michelangelo and Murillo, but revealed to Sesshu and Tanyu. An impartial seeker of truth, unbiased by love or hate, finds it under varied forms and aspects, wherever he may wander."

CENTRAL EUROPEAN IMMIGRATION

BY F. W. BAUMGARTNER

IMMIGRATION from Central Europe has recently been the subject of much discussion in Canada. There appears to be apprehension in certain sections of Canada lest the immigration of Central European peoples shall increase to such an extent as to modify seriously the texture of the Canadian population and to endanger British traditions and ideals. In response to the pressure of public opinion the Canadian Department of Immigration issued an order this spring reducing the number of farm labourers to be recruited this year from the non-preferred countries of Europe to thirty per cent of last year's numbers. At the same time all possible efforts are being made by the governments of Great Britain and of Canada, as well as by private, church, and other philanthropic institutions, to induce more British people to go to Canada. Upon the success or failure of these experiments must depend, to a large extent, the future of the immigration of Central European peoples. The character and extent of British immigration to Canada would not seem to warrant a complete suspension of continental immigration without working serious damage to the economic life of Canada. Many European nationalities, moreover, are already well established in Canada and have demonstrated their adaptability to the country and their usefulness to the nation.

It is the purpose of this article to give a brief summary of the more important groups of people in South-east Central Europe from whom immigrants are recruited for Canada. These may be divided into three groups: (1) Germans or "German-speaking", that is, people of German origin living in south-eastern Europe; (2) Slavs, including Jugo-Slavs,

Czecko-Slovaks, Ruthenians, Russians, and Poles, and (3) Hungarians.

All over eastern Europe, in the former Hungarian districts of Slavonia, Syrmia, Batchka and Banat, now included within Jugoslavian and Roumanian frontiers; in the former Austrian provinces of Galicia and Bukovina, now divided among Czecko-Slovakia, Poland and Roumania; in the eastern Roumanian provinces of Bessarabia and Dobrutcha; in southern Russia, on the plains bordering the Black Sea; in the Crimea, in the Volga provinces, and in Siberia, there are to be found scattered colonies of German people. Their ancestors migrated to eastern countries from Germany a century or two centuries ago, to Russia chiefly under the reign of Catherine, to Austro-Hungarian territories in the reign of Maria Theresa. Isolated colonies moved eastward even earlier, such as, for example, the Transylvanian Saxons who moved into the inner Carpathian valleys and hills during the eleventh century. The newer German colonies were formed by people mostly from the southern and western parts of Germany; they are mostly Roman Catholic and are generally known as "Schwabben" (Svabians). Protestant villages, however, may also be found; the Saxons are all Lutherans, as also are most of the Bessarabian Germans and the Volga colonies. Similar village colonies were established by the Mennonites, that German sect well known in Canada, which migrated to Russia from western Germany, Holland and Switzerland at the end of the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth centuries, and whose isolated life and religious principles have stamped them almost as a nationality by themselves.

From these eastern European colonies a large proportion of the German elements in the Canadian West has been recruited. Many went first to the United States when the mid-western States, Minnesota, the Dakotas, Montana, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Kansas, were being filled up. At the

beginning of this century many of these were attracted by the better land in the Canadian prairie, where they took homesteads and bought the yet cheaper land and settled some districts almost exclusively. Old acquaintances and relatives have come to join them by the direct route from the home colonies, and the movement still continues.

These German people are especially well equipped as settlers of the Canadian prairie. With few exceptions they are a purely agricultural people; some have owned land, others have worked as agricultural labourers or renters. Their ancestors have turned the swamps of the Danubian plains and the steppes of southern Russia into some of the finest and most productive agricultural areas of the world. With grants of free land they were induced by the monarchs of the time to make arduous journeys, on foot and on wheel, from Germany to these almost unknown lands. After many years of trials and after a long period of acclimitization when many a colony was wiped out by disease, human and animal pests and robber bands, some began to thrive and to increase. From the original colonies new ones spread out when land in the neighbourhood was no more to be bought or became too dear. These German villages are at once recognized by their neatness and cleanliness, the surrounding fields by their good tillage. Remains of the original communal life still exist in the common pasture and herdsmen for their herds of cattle, sheep, swine or flocks of geese. The countries where they were settled were originally in most cases plain and steppe, not unlike the Canadian prairie; grain raising was always the most important branch of agriculture and many traces of the once universal "Three Field System" may still be found.

Political and even personal connections with the home land, Germany, have long ceased. Scarcely do there exist indistinct traditions and stories about the trekking of their forefathers from their homes in Würtemberg, Alsace or the

Rhine Palatinate to these eastern plains. In yearly village festivals, "Kirchweih," vague memories of the first settlement, the foundation of the colony or the church, are celebrated. The fundamental German characteristics, love of the soil, perseverance, thoroughness and diligence in the working of the land have been preserved almost intact even though, in their isolation among strange peoples, they may not have kept step entirely with the cultural progress of their brothers in Germany and may even have adopted some of the peasant characteristics of the East. Racially of similar stock to the Anglo-Saxon, free from the political vices with which modern pre-war Germans were charged, with no strong attachment to the countries where they come from, except as pertains to their soil and to their relatives and acquaintances, there should be no hindrance to these Germanic peoples making good Canadian settlers and to their ultimate merging with Anglo-Saxon stock.

The pure Slavs are racially closely related to the Germanic type of peoples; they are light in the colour of the skin, blond or brown of hair, tall in figure and oval-faced. A certain amount of Asiatic inmixture is noticeable among the Russians and southern Europeans. The purest Slav types are perhaps most common among the northern Croatians, Slovaks and Ruthenians. Slovenes and Czechs are, no doubt, mixed to a considerable extent with German blood, as many of the names would indicate and as the close contact throughout history may explain.

The districts from which Slavs from Jugoslavia emigrate are chiefly Croatia and Slovenia. Serbians from old Serbia emigrate comparatively little; Macedonians, Montenegrins and Dalmatians are practically excluded from Canada, because of type and colour and because their occupations vary too greatly from those they are expected to follow in Canada; very few are recruited in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The former Austrian province of Krain forms the north-western corner of Jugoslavia, and covers the mountain and hill lands of the south-eastern slope of the Alps, the head lands of the Drave and Save rivers and valleys. Croatia adjoins Slovenia in the south and east and reaches from the Hungarian frontier at the Drave river, taking in the main portion of the lower Drave and Save valleys and their tributaries, to the upper Adriatic coast.

Both Slovenes and Croatians are a robust, hard working peasant people. The country, except the valley bottoms, is chiefly rolling and hilly, and in many places none too productive. This is especially true of the Karst mountain district, the so-called Lika plateau, an irregular high land inside the Karst ranges which rise abruptly from the Adriatic coast and from which practically the whole Balkan peninsula slopes eastward. It is claimed that these mountains were once covered with heavy oak forest but were denuded by the Venetians who built their city on oak piles from this region and traded its lumber to all the world. Lack of proper protection and management during all these troublesome times has probably been chiefly responsible for the destruction of practically all vegetation on the western slope and over the tops. This region, though grandiose in its desolation, is like a sea of sterile rocks, spread out farther south through Herzegovina and Montenegro. The rushing rains and the "Bora", the wind that sweeps down from the inland towards the coast, remove promptly the particles of earth that may form from the disintegrating rocks. Only along the coast and in the deeper valleys are there appreciable accumulations of earth and fertile spots of land. That the region was once much richer would be indicated, among other things, by the fact that early Croatian history centres chiefly along the Adriatic coast and that there, and even on some of the Dalmatian islands, have originated some of the oldest famous families. Inside of

the ranges vegetation becomes gradually richer and some of the eastern slopes of the mountains are heavily wooded. The plateaus, however, are still covered with a meagre layer of earth and here and there protrudes the bare lime rock between which are the irregular fields and meadows. Typical of the Karst region are the so-called "Dole", valley-like bottoms without any outlet, varying in size from fairly large plains, with rivers running through, to small pockets. Here rivers disappear suddenly in the ground to reappear again quite far distant. With an underground so impervious and many subterranean channels, the upper soil is exposed to drought when frequent rains fail. The winters on these Lika plateaus are fairly severe. The people are hardy and frugal; corn bread is their main food. The tillable land is cultivated, if necessary, by hand digging and the rest is devoted to sheep raising. Lika young lamb, roasted on the spit, is a special delicacy with Croats. Nearer the forests men supplement their earnings by working in the woods and are good axemen.

All of Croatia and Slovenia is comparatively thickly populated and the land is rather minutely divided. This condition, combined with the comparative poverty of parts of the country and also, to some extent, with political discontent and hard times, has tended to encourage emigration to foreign lands. Many have gone to the United States and to South America. Canada has only recently come to their notice but is now the preferred country for their emigration; many more would go than are allowed entry. Although good workers, especially in lumber and stone, as colonizers of the prairie they have so far not proven quite equal to the Germans. They incline more to go into mining and industrial occupations and by their earnings help to support the dependents at home. The law of the land does not permit families to emigrate, but when a husband is settled abroad he can bring his wife and children. It appears, however, that they are beginning to take more to

the land in Canada and think less of returning home. There are several settlements of Croatians in Saskatchewan, between Regina and Saskatoon, and some in Alberta and British Columbia, which seems to have particular attractions for them because of its varied resources.

There are also a few settlements of Ruthenians and Slovaks in Jugoslavia which were established under the old Austro-Hungarian Empire in the southern and eastern parts of the Danubian plains in the same way as the German colonies already mentioned. These Ruthenians and Slovaks appear to be of an excellent type, good workers and attached to the soil; this attitude appears to have been encouraged by their close contact with their German and Hungarian neighbours, steady and honest people. Lack of the necessary cash and the difficulties of selling their properties prevents many from emigrating to Canada.

From the Roumanian Banat, besides the Germans, are recruited a few Serbians whose ancestors settled there and who live more or less mixed with Germans, Hungarians and Roumanians. While Serbians of Serbia show little inclination to emigrate, the Roumanian Serbians, forming a minority, are pressing to get out. There are many very good types, especially such that have worked with German farmers or on Hungarian estates, but few have the funds necessary to enable them to move with their families. As enterprising farmers they are not equal to Germans or Ruthenians.

The Ruthenians or Ukrainians are a nationality well known in Canada and especially in the prairie provinces where they have settled. Their chief home land is in eastern Galicia and in the Bukowina, former provinces of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. As Galicia is now again joined to Poland and Bukowina to Roumania the Ruthenians are one of the disappointed nationalities in the post-war settlement of Europe; their hopes of being reunited into a national state of

their own, that is, the reviving of the old state of Ukraïn, have come to nothing and they are more divided than before. The Ruthenians are perhaps the most typical Slav people. According to the best authorities and to newest research, the country on the north slope of the Carpathians, Bukowina and eastern Galicia, is the real cradle of the Slav family of peoples. There they may have lived for centuries or thousands of years before the great migrations, when that extraordinary spreading and shifting of peoples took place. Some have gone west and north, the Czechs, Slovaks, the Wends of history, and the Poles; the Russians went eastward, and others southward into the Balkans where they became the Bulgars, the Serbs, the Croatians and Slovenes. Ruthenians are, therefore, the remains of the original block.

In the Ruthenians is perhaps typified a general weakness of the Slav races, which might be termed an extreme democratic spirit, or an inability to submit to their own leaders. This seems to have been their fate throughout the whole of Slav history. Only as the result of the upheaval of the Great War have most of them—not the Ruthenians, however—succeeded in forming their own national states; and all is not well yet in several of these states.

As colonizers of the Canadian prairies the Ruthenians have a creditable record. Not only have many succeeded in acquiring solid comfort, if not wealth, from the land, but they have been able to thrive on lands that were considered second rate and were passed over by the less modest Anglo-Canadian, American or German pioneers. That they are an intelligent, eager-minded people and that they are well able to take their place in the Canadian nation is demonstrated by the progress the first settlers and their descendants have made, by the comparatively large numbers of Ruthenians that are enlisted in the Canadian universities and other higher institutions of learning. This is the more creditable to them since in the

home land they were one of the most neglected and poorest of European peoples. The land was to a great extent in the hands of large Polish and German estate holders while little was left for the villagers themselves. Without a national state of their own since the middle ages, and torn between the politics of Austria, Poland and Russia, it was only by traditions that a national consciousness has been kept alive, while any cultural progress was naturally seriously handicapped. That they did not disappear as a nationality is a sign of strength rather than of weakness. The nationalistic feeling is noticeable among Ruthenians in Canada and has often been laid to their charge. It is not our purpose to discuss here the question of the desirability or undesirability, from a Canadian point of view, of some national consciousness, of adherence to cherished traditions in the first generations. One may observe, however, that by means of that veneration for traditions, which has guided the people in the old land, are preserved some of the most valuable human qualities during the disrupting process of adjustment in the new land.

While Ruthenians make good construction, mine and factory workers, their main ambition is to own a piece of land for which they hungered in the old country. This explains why they have settled such considerable areas of the prairie. And being thus firmly established little difficulty is experienced in placing new-comers from the old land.

The Czechs, the most advanced of the Slav family, are more of an industrial people and are not emigrating to Canada in large numbers.

Racially the Hungarians are the farthest removed from the Anglo-Saxon, French or Germanic races. The pure Magyar is of Asiatic or Mongolian type. The degree of purity of the Magyar blood is a matter of contention. There is no doubt that during the migrations and in the course of history a good deal of Slav and German blood has been infused,

beside that many Slavs and Germans have been actually magyarized and consider themselves Hungarians and speak no other tongue. Hungarian peasants are a hard working, hardy class that should in most cases make good settlers. Hungary is still a country of large estates. In the succession states, Roumania and Jugoslavia, the large properties have mostly been broken up by the Agrarian reforms. Many of the emigrants who go to Canada are recruited from the labourers who have worked for generations on these estates. The faithfulness to their former masters causes many of follow them to Canada where several have bought larger tracts of land or are engaged in the land business. Hungary was always one of the most advanced countries in agriculture; the background of experience possessed by the Hungarian emigrants should be a valuable asset wherever they settle.

CURRENT EVENTS

THE POLITICS OF THE OTHER DOMINIONS.

The domestic politics of the other Dominions are not necessarily of paramount interest to the Canadian people but they cannot afford to neglect such developments as occur for the simple reason that changes of government may produce important changes of policy which have a substantial bearing upon the mutual relations of the different units of the Commonwealth. Canada is the only self-governing Dominion which has escaped the experience of a general election in the last twelve months and in two of them, Australia and New Zealand, Ministries have been ejected from office and administrations of a different character installed.

The people of South Africa did not see fit to change their government but the continuity of liveliness which has been visible in their politics from the formation of the Union in 1909 promises to persist because within its bounds there has emerged in high relief the tremendous issue of the relations of the white and coloured races, a question whose settlement is fraught with fateful import for the whole world. Since the formation of the Union South African politics have always shown a certain racial tinge. The old Progressive party, led by Cecil Rhodes' friend and disciple, Dr. Jameson, enjoyed the allegiance of a majority of the British elements in the early Parliament. But just before the Great War when the Nationalist party founded by General Hertzog had begun to show formidable strength, its leaders voluntarily compassed its extinction by merging it with the South African party which Generals Botha and Smuts had organized after South Africa received its Dominion constitution. These British elements formed the core of the South African party which

Smuts has led since Botha's death, but allied with them were a substantial body of moderate Dutch who believed in General Smuts and his policies of racial conciliation and Imperial co-operation. With this backing Smuts carried on successfully for some time after Botha's death, but at the election of 1924 he found himself abandoned by many of his Dutch supporters and there came into power a Coalition Ministry headed by General Hertzog and composed of Nationalists and Labourites. The Nationalists derived their main strength from the back veldt farmers who are almost to a man of Dutch and Huguenot blood, but they had also some support in the country towns and profited greatly by the help of the Dutch preachers. The Labour party which was led by Colonel Cresswell, an Englishman of good education who had been a mine manager, was chiefly composed of British workers, but it had also attracted to itself a number of Dutch "poor whites" driven from the land to mining and other urban occupations.

The Hertzog administration which emerged from the election of 1924 was known as the "pact" Ministry because before the campaign began the Labour and Nationalist leaders had entered into a pact defining concrete terms of co-operation; it was in possession of a comfortable majority, and had in some ways a successful career. Five years of general prosperity enabled it to produce a series of budget surpluses and reduced taxation and its management of public finances and debt was careful. It also won favour in many quarters for its encouragement of industrial expansion and its policy of reserving the revenues from the rich new diamond fields at the mouth of the Orange River for the public instead of turning them over to some great mining corporation for exploitation. But it also courted trouble in other directions; it provoked the British elements to furious wrath by a proposal for a new South African flag in which the Union Jack should not be included and, although eventually a compromise was reached,

the bitter controversy which raged stirred up racial animosities to an unwholesome degree. Then it added fuel to the flames when it concluded a new trade treaty with Germany which, although it did not destroy the existing British preferences, made their extension virtually impossible and was interpreted by British South Africans as a blow directly aimed at the Imperial connection. General Hertzog was therefore facing bitter opposition when the term of the last Parliament was drawing nigh and General Smuts and the South African party seemed to be gaining ground. Then Hertzog took the decision to bring the native problem into the political arena for settlement.

The last census of South Africa showed that the coloured people numbered 5,409,092 as compared with 1,670,600 whites, and consequently the native problem perpetually haunts the South African mind. It has become more acute in recent years because as the result of the cessation of tribal wars and preventative measures against epidemic diseases the native population has been increasing with great rapidity. A large part of it is segregated on special reserves and these have become hopelessly overcrowded with the result that there has been a steady native clamour for more land. The natives have developed a new racial consciousness and, thanks to the organizing ability of one Clements Kadalie, there has come into existence a formidable organization called the Industrial and Commercial Workers' Union with 100,000 coloured members. Last session, on the plea that the native problem demanded urgent treatment, Hertzog introduced to the South African Parliament a series of Bills designed to deal with it. Some of the measures proposed an allocation of more land to the natives, but the Bill which aroused the fiercest controversy concerned the political representation of the natives under the principle established by Cecil Rhodes of equal rights for all civilized men south of the Zambesi. About 15,000 coloured

people in the Cape province had acquired the franchise and retained it under the Union although their brethren in the other provinces did not then secure it. Hertzog's first proposal was that this coloured franchise of the Cape should be wiped out and that for the whole Union there should be compiled a separate roll of native voters who would elect special representatives. These were to be Europeans and were not to enjoy the full voting rights of ordinary members. After submitting the Bills to Parliament, Hertzog tried to avoid party controversy by referring them to a select committee drawn from all three parties, but although he agreed to some modifications of the original plan he could not secure an agreement.

The decision was then taken to fight the election which took place in June on the native question and to appeal for a mandate for the Governmental policies. The campaign which followed was not exactly of a nature creditable to the Nationalist party and Bishop Talbot of Pretoria subsequently declared that he felt it impossible "as a Christian leader to refrain from an expression of disgust at the shameless exploitation of anti-native feeling during the general election." The Nationalists used to the limit the slogan "South Africa for the white men and no vote for the natives," and they accused Smuts on the strength of some unfortunate observations of working for the establishment of a great "black Dominion" with South Africa as "the white spot on the tail." Smuts and his lieutenants did their best to cope with this sort of propaganda, but all the basest fears of the Dutch rural population had been aroused and, when the polls were declared, it was found that the Nationalists with 78 seats commanded a clear majority of the House of Representatives. The South African party, thanks largely to an increase in the total membership of the House, had risen to 61 but the Labour party, split into two factions, had been reduced to a mere

remnant. Hertzog with his clear majority of Nationalists was in a position to dispense with his Labour allies but he preferred to retain Colonel Cresswell and two other Labourites in his Ministry. He could claim a mandate for his native policies, but one insuperable obstacle to the passage of the Native Representation Bill existed in the fact that the extinction of the coloured vote in the Cape province was a constitutional change and the requisite two-thirds majority of the two Houses in joint session which was indispensable for its accomplishment was not available.

Evidence soon emerged that the tares which had been sown to defeat Smuts were springing up. The character of the late campaign had not escaped the notice of the native population and they could scarcely fail to draw the deduction that they could not hope for any redress of their wrongs or generous treatment from the Hertzog Ministry. Within the last few months the restlessness which has been simmering underground for years began to manifest itself openly and in Natal and other parts of the Union the natives and the half-castes have been holding meetings and discussing their grievances in somewhat minatory fashion. There have actually been some serious clashes with the police and a number of native leaders have been arrested on the charge of seditious activities. Mr. Oswald Pirow, K.C., a pugnacious politician of extreme Nationalist views, whom General Hertzog recently drafted into his Cabinet to replace Mr. Tielman Roos in the Ministry of Justice, is assiduously developing the theory that communistic propaganda directed from Moscow is responsible for the native unrest, but experienced observers of the South African scene take little stock in this explanation and hold that its source lies in a deep-rooted dissatisfaction of the native population with its economic, social and political status.

Faced with this serious situation which has evidently already got upon the nerves of the white population, Hertzog

seems at last to have awakened to realities. He is shrewd enough to know that if the natives develop a solidarity of sentiment and adopt an attitude of aggressive defiance there is no longer any room for bitter political divisions among the whites. In the last two months he has completely changed his tune; he has held out the olive branch to the South African party for a non-party settlement of the native problem; he has denounced the idea of a South African as Governor-General, and he has forced at a Nationalist congress the withdrawal of a resolution favouring complete independence. These are belated moves to appease the British elements whose support will be badly needed if real trouble develops from the native unrest and they have met with a sympathetic response. Meanwhile Smuts who is too much of a philosopher to be a good politician has been in Britain delivering most statesman-like lectures under the auspices of the Rhodes Trust upon the relations of the white and black races and he may soon be badly needed in his own country where the natives trust him as they do no other politician.

The politics of Australia have a much less picturesque background. It is the only Dominion in which a Labour party has come to a commanding position although collectivist experiments may have been carried just as far in New Zealand and consequently, in the absence of any racial cleavage or coloured problem of a serious nature, politics have largely turned upon economic issues. The Labour party under the leadership of such politicians as James Watson, Andrew Fisher and W. M. Hughes was strong enough twenty years ago to secure office and the two old parties, the Liberals and Conservatives, finding that perseverance with their ancient quarrel about the fiscal question meant the perpetual ascendancy of Labour, were obliged to coalesce. "Billy" Hughes, a Welsh immigrant who has been the stormy petrel of Australian politics for at least two decades, left the Labour party

and during the war emerged as the head of a new political organization styled the Nationalist party. He directed the national war effort with great energy and cut some figure in the Imperial War Cabinets, but in the process he developed autocratic habits which offended his followers and in 1923 the Nationalist party ejected him from their leadership in favour of Mr. Stanley Bruce. Mr. Bruce, who belongs to a wealthy Melbourne family, had been educated at Cambridge University where he was a famous oarsman and, after serving with distinction in the war, had entered politics as a disciple of Hughes who appointed him Treasurer of the Commonwealth. By the time he came to the Premiership there had come into existence another party called the Country party which was the product of agrarian dissatisfaction with the Nationalist policy, but it required the united forces of the two parties to hold Labour in check and Dr. Earl Page, the leader of the Country party, served as Treasurer under Bruce. The Bruce Government swept the country at a general election in 1926 but, when it sought another mandate this spring, it had more difficulty in securing it and lost a number of seats. It had to contend with a steady accumulation of economic troubles. Borrowing had been carried to dangerous limits by the whole country, federal and state governments as well as private individuals and corporations, and Australian credit had been impaired in the financial markets of the world. Exports had shown a steady decline and a policy of extravagant protectionism had raised the cost of living to absurd heights. Moreover, the wool industry which is responsible for 40% of Australia's exports had been hard hit by a fall in the price of raw wool which is to-day selling at least 20% below its level of a year ago and its adversity produced a general recession in business which in turn created widespread unemployment. The employers tried to reduce wages and a series of strikes and bitter industrial conflicts resulted. Some grandiose immigration

schemes also came to grief and the Bruce Ministry found itself struggling with a welter of difficulties.

But it seemed more or less settled in power for another term until Bruce suddenly forced an issue which had fatal results for himself and his party. Industrial arbitration has long been an integral part of the social and economic machinery of Australia but there has existed a dual system of federal and state arbitration courts. It was quite possible for these two sets of courts to give conflicting awards in the same case, and naturally such a situation lent itself to abuse both by employers and workers. At last, having been driven to desperation by a series of ruinous strikes, Bruce decided that drastic surgery was necessary to clear up the situation. He first approached the state governments with a proposal that they should give up their arbitration courts and, when it was rejected, announced that he would wipe out the Federal arbitration courts. The issue was freely discussed at the general election in the spring and Bruce thinking that he had secured a clear mandate for his policy proceeded as soon as the new Parliament met to introduce a bill for its accomplishment. The Labour party, to whose leadership Mr. J. H. Scullin had succeeded two years ago on the retirement of Mr. Matthew Charlton, was in a position of some embarrassment for its leaders had time and again denounced the Federal Arbitration Courts and had often abetted strikes against their awards.

The Labourites decided to challenge the Ministry on this issue and they attacked the Abolition of Arbitration Bill on the ground that since industry was now being organized in large units which often extended beyond the bounds of any single state, abolition of Federal Arbitration was a reactionary step and on the more damaging charge that it was the preliminary step to a general reduction of wages. By themselves the Labourites could not have stopped the passage of the bill but

they found a formidable ally in Mr. Hughes who had never forgiven Mr. Bruce for supplanting him and had been biding his time for a deadly stroke of revenge. Assuming the leadership of a small group of Nationalist malcontents of whom some disliked the bill and others had developed a personal antagonism to Mr. Bruce, Hughes brought into effective play his gift of vitriolic oratory and after the exasperated Premier had solemnly read him out of the Nationalist party, he had the satisfaction of moving the amendment through which the government and its bill were defeated by a single vote. Mr. Bruce immediately sought and obtained a dissolution and at the opening of the campaign the general expectation was that his appeal for a special mandate for his bill would be successful. But times were bad, unemployment was rife, some of the Ministry's measures for the restoration of financial stability were unpopular and, as it turned out, the bill which was the chief issue of the election ran counter to an ingrained Australian prejudice in favour of industrial arbitration. The working classes accepted the Labour thesis that a drive for lower wages was impending; the civil servants, who are a numerous body in Australia, feared its effect upon their fortunes and the *Melbourne Age*, an influential paper which is anti-Labour in its general tendencies, backed Mr. Hughes and the dissenting Nationalists in their crusade against the Government.

Polling took place on October 12th and the result astounded even the Labour leaders. There was only a turnover of some 45,000 votes but it was sufficient to give Labour gains which brought its strength up from 31 to 46 out of the 75 seats in the House of Representatives and to register for it the most decisive triumph in Australian political history; the Nationalists were reduced to 15 and there were 10 members of the Country party and four Independents including Mr. Hughes who was re-elected with Labour help. Mr. Bruce, who had lost his own seat, immediately resigned office and Mr.

Scullin formed a presentable Ministry whose personnel is regarded as indicating the supremacy for the moderate elements of his party. Mr. Scullin, who entered politics by the door of journalism, is counted an honest and cautious type of politician, who will not want to court trouble by extremist policies, but the dominant figure of the Ministry will probably be the Treasurer, Mr. E. G. Theodore né Feodoroff, the son of a Roumanian immigrant, who had a stormy career as Premier of Queensland; he has already provoked an outcry from the wealthy classes by imposing a stiff supertax on large incomes on the plea that funds must be found to balance the Budget. Steps have also been taken to abolish the system of compulsory military training which has now existed for many years, but the protectionism which has been carried to such extreme lengths is likely to be increased rather than abated. The new Ministry will perforce have to concentrate for a time upon plans for economic and financial rehabilitation and, even if it did venture to offer fresh doses of socialism, the strong Nationalist majority in the Senate will for at least three years provide a check.

Mr. Bruce, who deserves more credit than he got for the courage of some of his utterances and measures and was most unfairly attacked for being too English in his habits and view—he made the fatal error of always wearing spats—has had to bear the chief odium of the defeat and his indignant party have deposed him from the leadership in favor of the late Attorney-General, Mr. J. G. Latham. But obviously as long as the Opposition forces are divided the Scullin Ministry will have an easy path and the *Melbourne Age*, while rejoicing in the defeat of the reactionary elements which in its opinion have ruined the Nationalist party, thinks there is a real place for a new party “opposed to Labour and representing the moderate but genuinely progressive elements of the country with liberal humanitarianism as its guiding principle.”

The politics of New Zealand have largely partaken of the nature of factional struggles and it has often been difficult for an outsider to discern any serious difference in principle in the policies of the different parties. There is no party which styles itself Conservative and nobody who has been in power during the last twenty years has made any serious attempt to destroy the collectivist framework of economic organization established by the celebrated "Dick" Seddon who was for years a sort of political Czar in New Zealand. After his death the Liberal party which he led fell upon evil days and the outbreak of the war found its Reform opponents in power under the leadership of Mr. W. F. Massey, who owed his strength largely to the support of the farmers. During the war years Massey found it necessary to bring the Liberal leaders into a Coalition Government, but he discarded them after the arrival of peace and carried on successfully until his death in 1922. He was succeeded by Mr. J. G. Coates who had a fine war record but proved a much less competent politician than his predecessor. He carried easily one general election in 1925, but by the time he came to seek another mandate in November, 1928, the opposition forces had accumulated strength and his position had become precarious. His only hope of survival lay in the lack of unity among his opponents but shortly before the campaign opened Sir Joseph Ward, a veteran politician of great experience who had served for several years as Premier, emerged from a state of semi-retirement and took the field as the head of an organization called the United Party in which the Liberals and discontented agrarian elements coalesced; Labour kept aloof and ploughed its own furrow. During the campaign Sir Joseph, although he did not offer a programme easily distinguishable from that of Mr. Coates, drove home the varied indictments against the Government with great skill and, when the votes were counted, it was found that the Coates Ministry which had in the previous parliament held 55 out of

the 80 seats in the House of Representatives had had its parliamentary strength reduced to 28. Sir Joseph Ward had 32 followers, and after Labour had joined him in voting the Coates Ministry out of office, he formed a Government at the ripe age of 73. The New Zealand correspondent of the *Round Table* described it as "a far more promising alternative to the Coates Cabinet than had seemed probable before the election" and it included in Sir Apirana Ngata a full-blooded Maori who is one of the ablest men ever produced by that race.

It was of course a minority government as Labour held 19 seats, but Sir Joseph Ward is an exceedingly shrewd political strategist and he has carefully steered a course which has so far procured at least the benevolent neutrality of the Labour party. Lately he has been engaged in a sharp parliamentary struggle with the Reform Opposition over his Budget which included a drastic scheme of taxation of land values designed to break up the large estates and promote closer land settlement. Its cardinal feature is a graduated supertax on land of an improved value in excess of \$65,000 coupled with a reduction of the exemption allowed for mortgages on such lands and it has naturally aroused fierce opposition from the wealthier landowners, who claim that the taxation is confiscatory, but the latest cables indicated that its passage was assured. The Ward Ministry is also taking authority to spend 25 million dollars on land settlement schemes and is willing to encourage a substantial amount of emigration. New Zealand like Australia has suffered from the fall in the price of wool and there has been some difficulty in balancing recent Budgets, but the new taxation which also includes a small all-round increase in import duties should produce a surplus next year. Sir Joseph Ward, having reached the dignity of New Zealand's "Grand Old Man," is not likely to be ejected from power, but at his years the Premiership is too severe a strain to be endured for long and

his retirement might leave his Government in troubled waters. If, however, Sir Joseph who has always been a perfervid Imperialist survives to attend the next Imperial Conference, his voice will be heard in vigorous opposition to the Nationalist tendencies which have dominated the council-table at the last two conferences. The new Australian Premier will be much less Imperialist than Mr. Bruce, but as a Labourite he will be more apt to work in harmony with the MacDonald Government and he has already proclaimed his intention of giving it cordial co-operation in its policies of disarmament. The signs also indicate that Hertzog will be found in a much less intransigent mood and if the Irish Free State is bent upon pushing separatist policies to extremes, its representatives may find no supporters from the other Dominions.

J. A. STEVENSON.

THE POLITICAL SCENE.

The major political occurrences in Canada during recent months were (1) the overwhelming victory of Mr. Howard Ferguson's government in Ontario, (2) the death of Mr. James Robb, Minister of Finance, and (3) the appointment of Mr. Charles A. Dunning as Mr. Robb's successor. While fought entirely upon local issues, the Conservative triumph in Ontario will undoubtedly have repercussions in the Dominion field. It is no secret, indeed, that Mr. Ferguson's decision to hold an election this year was influenced by a feeling on the part of Mr. Bennett that a triumph for Conservatism in the province would in its moral effect and in other ways be of valuable assistance to him in the Dominion election of 1930. Mr. Bennett probably realizes, and with good cause, that if he is to lead his party to victory at the next election it will be necessary for him to make very considerable gains in the one province where Mr. King, at the the present time at all events, reveals the greatest weakness.

There is hardly any doubt but that the next election will be fought upon a tariff issue. As Ontario is the chief fighting ground of Canadian protectionists, it is not difficult to understand Mr. Bennett's strategy. In the course of his western tour the Conservative leader left hardly a doubt as to the character of the tactics he intends to pursue. These tactics will take the form of trusting to fate and Mr. Houde in the province of Quebec; to the peculiar political conditions which have developed in the prairie provinces; and to the traditional allegiance of British provinces like Ontario and British Columbia to protection, an allegiance tinged with something of hostility towards the United States, and made more acute in recent months by the tariff threats of the United States governments. Conservative leaders in Canada have never quite forgotten what happened in 1911, and that, indeed, has influenced much of Conservative fiscal policy ever since. Mr. Meighen, for reasons that need not be entered into here, failed to reap the full advantage of this strategy, but that has not extinguished a belief on the part of Tory strategists that it is along such a line of attack that victory will eventually come. Hence the importance to Mr. Bennett of a provincial Conservative victory which left the fighting forces of the party in aggressive battle array and in readiness for the moment when they will be called upon to go to his assistance.

* * * * *

Nor is evidence wanting that Mr. King and his General Staff are preparing to meet Mr. Bennett upon his chosen issue. That, indeed, is the chief meaning and significance that must be attached to the appointment of Mr. Dunning, a western low tariff advocate, as Minister of Finance. After eight years of office, during which he has regarded the Liberal tariff policy of 1919 as a "chart", the Prime Minister has quite clearly come to the conclusion that need for one more Liberal victory at the polls dictates a return to the old low tariff war-cries which

were used successfully to restore the fortunes of Liberalism in 1921. Mr. Robb, although a professed Liberal, was in reality a conservative, and certainly a moderate protectionist. Mr. Fielding, his predecessor, brought more budgets to parliament than any Finance Minister in the history of Empire politics, but it is not on record that he ever seriously interfered or wished to interfere with the policy of protection. The truth is that between 1921 and 1929 the Liberal party went no further in the direction of low tariff than was made politically desirable by the presence in the House of a western anti-protectionist representation. Mr. Fielding, Mr. Robb, Mr. Malcolm, Mr. Euler, Sir Lomer Gouin—these were all strong tariff advocates; against them the low tariff views of men like Mr. King, Mr. Dunning, and, to some extent, Mr. Lapointe, could not prevail.

To-day the position has changed. Mr. Fielding, Mr. Robb and Sir Lomer Gouin, the three great protagonists of protection, have passed from the scene. In their place, and now making their influence felt, are Mr. Dunning, Mr. Ralston, Mr. Lapointe and Mr. King. Mr. Dunning, as Finance Minister, may not bring down a free trade or low tariff budget; it is certain that he will never bring down a protectionist budget. Western radicals and low tariff men have frequently come to Ottawa in shining armour, only speedily to find themselves grinding corn in the mills of the Philistines. Mr. Dunning, it must be admitted, is of a different mould. An aggressive and crafty politician, a fighting parliamentarian, a man who can make his influence felt in cabinet council, and with an acute appreciation of what low tariff apostacy might mean to his political future, he can be counted upon to go a fairly long distance in the direction of tariff policy which he has advocated both in Saskatchewan and in Ottawa. Nor need there be any doubt regarding Mr. Dunning's attitude on the fiscal question. It is set out in the records of the Legisla-

ture of Saskatchewan and also in the Hansard of the Dominion House of Commons. In 1923, when Mr. Dunning was Premier of Saskatchewan, the legislature of that province passed the following resolution:

“Resolved, that in the opinion of this assembly it is the duty of the government of Canada to introduce legislation which shall have for its effect the following:

1. An immediate and substantial all-round reduction of the customs tariff.

2. The reduction of the customs duty of goods imported from Great Britain to one-half charged under the general tariff, and that further gradual uniform reductions be made to the remaining tariff on British imports that will insure complete free trade between Great Britain and Canada.

“That negotiations be entered into by the government of Canada with the government of the United States with a view of establishing a reciprocity agreement on lines similar to that of 1911.

“The placing upon the free list of all food-stuffs, agricultural implements, farm and household machinery, vehicles, fertilizers, coal, lumber, cement, gasolene, illuminating fuel and lubricating oils and all raw materials and machinery used in their manufacture.”

This is not the only evidence given by Mr. Dunning regarding his tariff attitude. In August, 1923, the present Minister of Finance was called before the Royal Grain Inquiry Commission sitting at Regina. In the course of his evidence it was pointed out to him that there had been a recent reduction of freight charges on coal being shipped from western points to central Canada, and this Mr. Dunning opposed. The records of the hearing show this question and answer:

Q. There is a rate of $6\frac{1}{2}$ dollars a ton gone into effect to move a stated quantity, not a large quantity, merely as an experiment?

A. (Mr. Dunning.) I think that this is a case where the

Ontario people should take a dose of their own medicine. . . . The way to make Ontario people burn Alberta coal is to put a good steep prohibitive duty on American coal and then to let the Canadian National railways charge the fair freight rate for hauling it to them. It is the first time in history that the eastern people have been in the position to take a dose of their own medicine, and I think they should be allowed to take it to the full."

Again in the session of 1926 Mr. Dunning put himself on record regarding reciprocity. Hansard of that year shows the following dialogue:

Dr. Edwards: "Is there a minister sitting in the front row who will say that he thinks this country would be better off for putting into effect the reciprocity pact of 1911?"

Mr. Dunning: "Sure."

It is only fair to Mr. Dunning to point out that he showed capacity for adapting himself to changed conditions, political and otherwise, as the years went on; and in 1927 we find him making a fiscal pronouncement which would have done justice to the adroitness of the Prime Minister himself. Said Mr. Dunning then, speaking in support of Mr. Robb's budget, anything but low tariff:

"We have not ruined industry and we do not intend to. Our tariff reductions actually help the industries to which they have been applied. . . .

. . . "We shall move forward cautiously towards the goal of making our tariff structure bear as lightly as possible on production, industry, and the people generally, having always in view the greater prosperity of all the legitimate industries of Canada."

It would perhaps be unfair to Mr. Dunning to assume that he will signalize his entry into the department of Finance by a rapid assault upon the whole structure of protection. On the other hand, considering his record, and taking into account

also some very significant statements made by the Prime Minister on the occasion of his western tour, it is a fairly safe guess that Mr. Dunning's first budget will be definitely in the direction of a downward revision of the tariff. His policy, one believes—and it will not be a bad one—will be to seek strength in his prairie provinces by reduction of duties, coupled with an appeal to the loyal and British sentiment of British Columbia, Ontario and the Maritimes, by some measure looking toward development of Empire trade. As the first English-born Minister of Finance that Canada has had, Mr. Dunning could take this step quite logically and naturally. His reasoning would be, and it would be the reasoning of Mr. King, that as Liberalism is likely to suffer severe casualties on the Ontario front, regardless of its plan of battle, the best possible course to follow is to concentrate upon the west and the Maritimes, trusting that all will be well in Quebec no matter what is done. It is a policy that has won for Liberalism before; whether it will be successful again, time must be left to disclose.

* * * * *

There is, at the present writing, additional evidence that Mr. King is planning a low tariff campaign for 1930. It is found in the appointment of Mr. T. A. Crerar, sometime leader of the Progressive party, as Minister of Railways and Canals, in succession to Mr. Dunning. Mr. Crerar is not an aggressive political leader of the Dunning type. Something of an idealist, a man of goodwill, Mr. Crerar lacks those fighting, tenacious qualities which, in a democracy, always bring success, and it was these deficiencies, indeed, which caused the Progressive movement of 1921 to fail so miserably in parliament. But while Mr. Crerar is not a parliamentary swordsman, nor even a strong party general, it is undeniable that he has a large following, not merely in western Canada, but throughout the entire country. He may not advance the ministerial cause

in the House of Commons nor strengthen it greatly in council, but he will give it added potency with the public, and he will be just one more reason why at the next election the Liberal party will put its fate to the test on a platform of lower duties.

* * * * *

Premier King is not merely a skilful and adroit politician; he is an extraordinarily lucky politician. One year or six months ago, it seemed as though impetuous tariff action by Washington would put Mr. King's government into a most difficult position, and place a powerful weapon within the hands of Mr. Bennett. The mills of the gods, however, never ground as slowly as the machinery of Congress, and the consequence has been that while the United States tariff bill has been buffeted from White House to Senate and from Senate to House of Representatives, Mr. King has been afforded time and opportunity to devise a line of strategy likely to be adequate in the circumstances. Had the United States measure passed at the special session of Congress and been placed upon the statute books, it would have been extremely difficult for the government to get through the present session without making some sort of gesture of retaliation. As it is, Mr. King can very well plead, as he pleaded in the west, that unless and until it is known precisely what the United States government intends doing, little sense exists in any counter action on the part of Canada. Whether this cry will remain potent in the electoral campaign that is almost sure to come next autumn, time must be left to tell.

* * * * *

In so far as Mr. Bennett is concerned, it must be confessed that it is not quite clear what line of fiscal policy he intends to pursue. He, of course, and his lieutenants, will seek to make the most in parliament of what is being done by the United States; but it is one thing to cry aloud to heaven against a Government, and quite another thing to embalm

one's own policy in precise and definite language. It is yet to be seen, for example, just where Mr. Bennett and his party stand in the matter of inter-Imperial trade. Their attitude toward preferential arrangements entered into with Australia and New Zealand would certainly appear to leave their position on this question in considerable doubt.

Mr. Bennett, of course, is staking something upon an alleged change of political heart in the province of Quebec; and Quebec has never been wildly enthusiastic about Imperial trade. The reason for this supposed transformation in the French Canadian province is the new *Habitant Demosthenes*, Mr. Camilien Houde. Precisely who, what, or why Mr. Houde is, is not yet overly clear. All that is known of him in English-speaking Canada is that he is a gentleman who rose from the sidewalks of Montreal and brought with him to the turbulent field of Quebec politics a tireless energy, undoubted courage, a remarkably florid vocabulary, and some capacity for getting votes. It has been one of the tragedies of the Conservative party in Quebec that during the past thirty years, practically all of the fiery young orators gravitated to the Liberal party. From Mercier and Laurier to Lucien Cannon and Ernest Lapointe, all of the French Canadian platform gladiators have been Liberals, the Conservative champions having been singularly afflicted with a taciturnity quite uncharacteristic of the French Canadian race. Tariff politics do not make the difference in Quebec that many people suppose. What counts with the French Canadian to a far greater degree is drama, picturesque oratory, and magnetic personalities; and in this respect Mr. Houde, whatever else he may be, appears to be a distinct improvement upon men like E. L. Patenaude, almost Saxon in their incapacity to stir a crowd. Whether, however, Mr. Houde's eloquence makes much headway in shaking Quebec from its three-decade-old

allegiance to the Liberal party is something that only the next election can reveal.

* * * * *

So far as the coming session is concerned, it is likely to see much that is interesting both legislatively and politically. Mr. Dunning in his new department will have many matters apart from political strategy to engage his talents. There will be the problem of re-capitalization of the financial structure of the Canadian National Railways. There will likely be a government measure to prohibit export of liquor to the United States; reductions in the sales tax; return of the Natural Resources to Manitoba, Alberta and British Columbia; and one or two other matters of major importance. Mr. Dunning, too, will be called upon to confront the problem of taking care of more than \$1,000,000,000 of maturing loans between 1930 and 1935, a prospect that would have staggered the country ten or fifteen years ago.

The session may not be a long one. Both parties will be anxious to strengthen their breastworks in the constituencies, and with the budget over, and little to be gained by keeping the contending armies locked up in the House of Commons, prorogation is likely to come early in May..

M. GRATTAN O'LEARY.

BOOK REVIEWS

Three Studies in Elizabethan Literature

Marlowe and His Circle: A Biographical Survey. By Frederick S. Boas. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1929. Pp. 159.

Shakespeare and His Fellow Dramatists. Edited by E. H. C. Oliphant. Two vols. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1929. Pp. xvii, 1177 and xiii, 1173.

Hamlet. Edited by Joseph Quincy Adams. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1929. Pp. vii, 356.

Since the publication in 1925 of Dr. J. Leslie Hotson's *Death of Christopher Marlowe* there has been much discussion concerning the trustworthiness of the evidence on which the coroner's jury of sixteen men, at the inquest on June 1st, 1593, based its verdict. Marlowe had met a violent death two days earlier. The jury found one Ingram Frizer, "*in sua defensione & saluacione vite sue*," had delivered the fatal dagger-thrust ("*unam plagam mortalem super dexterum oculum suum*") that ended Marlowe. The witnesses were Nicholas Skeres and Robert Poley, who, with the tragic pair, Marlowe and Frizer, had met at an inn or house in Deptford kept by one Eleanor Bull, a widow, intending to dine and sup there. On June 28th the Court of Chancery, acting on Frizer's petition, and satisfied that he had acted in self-defence, granted him a full pardon.

Miss U. M. Ellis-Fermor, Miss E. De Kalb, Dr. S. A. Tannenbaum, and other students of Marlowe regard the evidence as unreliable, and incline to believe that he was deliberately assassinated for political reasons, as one who knew too much (thinks Miss De Kalb), especially of the activities

of that sinister secret agent, Robert Poley. Poley was the most influential witness, and the characters of all three survivors were such as to suggest possible collusion in the killing and afterwards in the giving of false testimony. Indeed, Miss De Kalb, writing in the *Times Literary Supplement* (21 May, 1925), asks "why Marlowe (under citation to appear before the Privy Council) should have met any three men and spent eight hours or more in retired colloquy with them, to be slain by one at the end. We are told that they behaved themselves decently and 'in quiet sort'—that is, that they were not carousing. . . . What had they in common for such long and sober discourse? . . . This death takes place while Marlowe is awaiting cross-examination by his former masters, the Lords of the Privy Council. If there was a deeper cause for quarrelling than the score it is not difficult to come at the nature of it."

While Miss De Kalb accepts the jury's finding that the four men were behaving quietly before the quarrel, she rejects the main conclusions. If, however, the coroner and jury erred at all (and they seem to have reviewed the proceedings of the group with conscientious care), it is much more likely that they were misinformed about the men's potations. Kyd regarded Marlowe as 'intemperate' and rash "in attempting soden pryvie iniuries to men." Marlowe and his mates on this last day may well have been much less than sober. As Dr. Hotson remarks, "in all probability the men had been drinking deep . . . and the bitter debate over the score had roused Marlowe's intoxicated feelings to such a pitch that, leaping from the bed, he took the nearest way to stop Frizer's mouth." It does not seem necessary to argue, with Miss De Kalb, that since Poley, Skeres and Frizer were all rogues, they must have conspired to slay Marlowe, even though Poley had formerly said to one William Yeomans in another connection: "I will sweare and forswear my selffe rather than I will accuse my selffe to doe me any harme." As Professor Boas

points out, Frizer was the host at this 'feast.' We know nothing that connects him "either with Marlowe's employment on Government service during his Cambridge days or with his later 'atheist' propaganda. There is thus no *prima facie* reason why he should have been determined at all costs to stop Marlowe's mouth for ever." Professor Boas rightly declines to reverse the verdict unless and until new evidence may require such reversal.

The death and the inquest are treated in the fifth chapter. The other chapters deal with the three Christopher Morleys of Marlowe's earlier days, with the notorious Poley and the other survivors, with the manner and meaning of Marlowe's 'atheism' and with the 'atheism' also of Richard Chomley and Sir Walter Raleigh. The First Appendix presents allegations against Marlowe in Thomas Kyd's letters; the Second offers a relevant documentary list.

Professor Oliphant's two portly anthologies contain forty-five Elizabethan plays, including fifteen of Shakespeare's, selected partly on the basis of merit and partly on the basis of representativeness as regards type, author, and time of production. It is a difficult task to make a good but limited anthology that will satisfy these requirements, especially if Shakespeare is to be included. No doubt Professor Oliphant has chosen fairly well. We think, however, that he makes far too much of his claim that Shakespeare is usually considered in college classes and lectures "as a solitary phenomenon". While it is more convenient, as regards time and organization, to study Shakespeare individually and to provide additional courses in Elizabethan drama at large, yet undergraduate courses in Shakespeare usually attempt to relate his work critically to his historical environment, and to offer reinforcing lectures and parallel reading designed to familiarize the student somewhat with the work of Shakespeare's forerunners and contemporaries. Professor Oliphant's selective processes

are, on the whole, often more fortunate than their critical accompaniment. He swallows whole, for example, Dr. Tannenbaum's unprovable theory of the "assassination" of Marlowe; he greatly underrates *Much Ado about Nothing*; his treatment of the reading of Elizabethan verse is elementary; his standards of comparison between Shakespeare and his fellows are not stable standards; his language is often petulant or over-positive; and in his anxiety to illuminate dramatic situations or individual states of mind, he cumbers the plays with original stage-directions, both objective and subjective, none of which seems indispensable. Consider such examples as these: "Macbeth enters, the victim of a struggle between conscience and ambition;" "Banquo has his doubts whether the honour has been achieved honestly;" "Hamlet is also present, evidently in dejected mood." These are superfluous attempts to do the dramatist's work for him. If editors generally felt called upon to supplement the text in this fashion what endless differences and debates would follow!

Even so able a scholar as Professor Adams, however, has not allowed himself to be deterred by such a consideration from introducing similar (although generally more defensible) stage-directions into his edition of *Hamlet*. Two that seem particularly questionable read as follows: "The Ghost sinks beneath the stage. Hamlet for a time stands dazed, then tremblingly sags to his knees." (Surely Hamlet is mechanically exclamatory rather than consciously prayerful here.) "Polonius, in his eagerness to see, stirs the curtain of the gallery, and Hamlet, out of the corner of his eye, spies the eavesdroppers." (The commentary on page 253 more nearly approaches Shakespeare's apparent intention.) The editor accepts Theobald's and Pope's suggestion of "Pointing to his head and shoulder" as a useful stage-direction in Act II, Scene ii, but ignores Dowden's explanation of line 156 as related to lines 166-7.

Professor Adams has collated and revised the text and has reorganized some of the scene-divisions. His long commentary upon the tragedy is thoughtfully considered and persuasively written, although a good deal of it seems too anxious to make things smooth for the student. With many of its more argumentative passages we reluctantly find ourselves in disagreement — reluctantly, because Professor Adams's scholarship in the Elizabethan field, especially on its historical and documentary side, is so admirable. But here he is essaying criticism of a more æsthetic and psychological kind, and, having adopted a definite theory of Hamlet's character and behaviour, is seeking to reinforce it with exposition and argument more legalistic, perhaps, than cogent. His formula is that disillusioned idealism produces melancholia, which causes inaction. Professor Adams's free citations of expert testimony from such students of mind as Krafft-Ebing, Macpherson and Régis unfortunately carry him too far. On page 218 he finds that although Hamlet's melancholy "colours his thinking and affects his will-power, it does not interfere with his full consciousness, and hence does not prevent our full sympathy." On pages 252, 271, 277, 279-80, however, Hamlet's case is diagnosed as sub-acute melancholia, with such pathological implications that we no longer feel that he has the inner freedom necessary to support tragic conflict. Our own view is that unadjusted idealism (a characteristic moment-symbol of which is *artistic* melancholy) sees the relative unimportance of 'action.' Professor Adams does not sufficiently recognize the dualism of Hamlet. The soliloquies can best be regarded we think, as dualistic dialogues between the objective Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, and the subjective Hamlet, philosophic idealist by both temper and training. The latter slowly but certainly conquers the former. Both Professor Bradley's view (the least satisfying of his lectures on the central tragedies) and that of Professor Adams appear to involve themselves in serious, indeed destructive inconsist-

encies. Yet Hamlet must remain a baffling figure for all interpreters. Keats thought him "more like Shakespeare himself in his common everyday life than any other of his characters." Perhaps he was, in some of his qualities. But Hamlet's melancholy (not so much induced as deepened by the loss of his father and the shame of his mother) is the native melancholy of the artist (potential or actual) and of the thinker, haunted by his awareness of the limitation of human life, the limitation of human language and the limitation of human love. As Masefield has put it, "Hamlet is too wise—his wisdom cannot get itself over into the world." At the last, he will be as inexplicable as ever. We can recognize his character; sympathize with his perplexities; appreciate his motive-weighings, his resolves, his reluctances; but we shall not be able to perceive the *why* of them all, except through a glass darkly.

G. H. C.

Ottawa Lyrics and Verses for Children. By Arthur S. Bourinot. Ottawa: The Graphic Publishers, Limited. 1929.

These songs are sung with a spontaneity that a more self-critical poet loses, unless he has the rare fortune to be a genius. They reveal a mind sensitive to beauty, alive to the moods of nature and aware, as true poets are, of the heart of a child. Moreover they belong to Canada. The reader feels with Mr. Bourinot the sense of future, the pulsing of enterprises yet to be born, an urge which the native-born accept unconsciously as they accept winter snows and summer luxuriance, but which Canada's adopted sons may find intoxicating as strong wine or dismaying as untracked prairie according to the disposition of the wanderer. Could these songs be sung in a language really indigenous to this country they might gain much.

Mr. Bourinot lets his lyricism control him instead of

controlling it, with the result that some charming sentiment is spoiled by clichés, too facile rhyme endings, strained inversions and occasional confusion of metaphor.

The 'Verses for Children' really are for children. Every little girl will love Cobwebs . . .

. . . "A million little spiders
Had worked the whole night through,
And washed their silver clothing
In drops of silver dew."

W. M. H.

English Comic Drama, 1700-1750. By F. W. Bateson.
Oxford University Press, 1929. 158 pp.

In this work on the English comic drama from 1700 to 1750 the author has carried on the story of English comedy from the point where his predecessor, Mr. Bonamy Dobrée, had left it in his exceedingly interesting *Restoration Comedy*, both works sponsored by the Oxford University Press. This new book, though quite up to the standard of the previous one, covers a far less vital and attractive period of the English drama. The Comedy of Manners had reached its highest point with Congreve, whose play *The Way of the World* (1700) is one of the most brilliant products of this school; in the first half of the eighteenth century, however, it gave place (largely owing to the vituperative attacks of Jeremy Collier) to the distinctly inferior Comedy of Sentiment. Instead of the sophisticated and amoral picture of life presented by the Restoration dramatists through the medium of a scintillating dialogue we get a rather mawkish and didactic type of play with stilted language and an obtrusive moral purpose. As we pass from Congreve and Wycherley to Steele and Cibber there may be an improvement in moral tone; there is certainly a distinct loss in artistic merit. The relatively minor rôle of drama during this period is indicated by the fact that the two outstanding writers in the group treated by the author—

Steele and Fielding—attained their greatest reputation in non-dramatic work. Steele is primarily an essayist and Fielding a novelist. Besides these major figures Mr. Bateson discusses the rather less familiar work of Cibber, Gay, Carey, and Mrs. Centlivre.

The best specimens of comic writing in this period are to be found in the burlesques, and of these the finest is decidedly Gay's *Beggar's Opera*, whose brilliant ridicule of the sentimental comedy, of French and Italian operatic fashions, and of contemporary politics has delighted both eighteenth century and modern audiences. Fielding's burlesque *Tom Thumb* is also of considerable interest, especially for the light that it throws on literary and dramatic tendencies, and forms a link between the earlier burlesque *The Rehearsal* and Sheridan's *Critic*, which appeared fifty years later. Most of the comedies of the age fall into these two groups—the comedy of sentiment and the comedy of ridicule—and the author of this work has given us an adequate account of both types in his extremely competent survey.

H. A.

A Cargo of Stories for Children. By Emma Lorne Duff.
Toronto: McClelland and Stewart. 1929. \$2.00.

The art of story-telling appeals to young and old alike, and the play of the imagination on the fabric of myths, folk-lore and other narratives is the sign manual of a real chronicler.

Lewes in his *Life and Works of Goethe* gives us a delightful picture of the homely inspiration which the poet received in his early childhood at the knees of his mother:

“This genial, indulgent mother employed her faculty for story-telling to his and her own delight. ‘Air, fire, earth and water I represented under the forms of princesses; and to all natural phenomena I gave a meaning, in which I almost believed more fervently than my little

hearers. . . I was as eager for the hours of story-telling as the children themselves; I was quite curious about the future course of my own improvisation, and any invitation which interrupted these evenings was disagreeable. There I sat, and there Wolfgang held me with his large black eyes; and when the fate of one of his favourites was not according to his fancy, I saw the angry veins swell on his temples, I saw him repress his tears. He often burst in with "But, mother, the princess won't marry the nasty tailor, even if he does kill the giant." And when I made a pause for the night, promising to continue it on the morrow, I was certain that he would in the meanwhile think it out for himself and so he often stimulated my imagination . . . His grandmother, who made a great pet of him, was the confidante of all his ideas as to how the story would turn out, and as she repeated these to me, and I turned the story according to these hints . . . Wolfgang saw with glowing eyes the fulfilment of his own conceptions, and listened with enthusiastic applause.' What a charming glimpse of mother and son."

Apart from the very important pedagogical value of story-telling to children, the healthy cultural value is noteworthy. Therefore, it is with considerable interest that we receive the announcement of *A Cargo of Stories for Children*, a book filled to overflowing with inspiration and stimulus to the imagination as well as of supreme childish pleasure to the countless number of children who either will read the stories for themselves or have them read to them by an indulgent mother, such as is pictured above.

The book is written by Emma Lorne Duff, who is an acknowledged authority on the art of story-telling to children. Her influence in this field and as an outstanding exponent of the Froebelian Kindergarten is recognized both in Canada and the United States in terms of the best educational standards. Miss Duff's post-graduate work in the course of study arranged by the New York Kindergarten Association under the direction of the late Susan E. Blow, and at Columbia Univer-

sity, was characterized by the unstinted praise of that eminent authority. Her own kindergarten has been a mecca for students and teachers from all parts of the country. Some years ago the Government of Sweden sent a representative to this continent to study kindergarten methods and in the report which was sent back it was declared unequivocally that in Miss Duff's kindergarten was to be found the purest example of Froebelian training on the continent.

A glance at the index to the book reveals a wide range of subjects treated—nature stories, fairy tales, and other stories of the imagination as well as Christmas stories. The introduction and notes give the adult reader a perspective of the setting and suggest the function of the story-teller. "The influence of a literature on a race is not greater than that of the baby-lore of nature and nursery tales of nature in all her forms upon a little child. Tales of the forces of nature, wind, water, light in all their varying phases . . . all influence the little denizen of the gardens and fields and forests or, alas! of the slums of our land."

The charm of the stories lies chiefly in their simplicity. The descriptive element brings out with vigour the succession of events. In the re-telling of the great Christmas stories, their compelling power is clothed in language most conducive to the stimulation of childish wonder and understanding.

The following passage taken from one of the stories included in the book is an intimation of the fine quality of which the *Cargo* is composed:

"Now, there were all sorts of things going on in the Toy Shop that night; Dinkey wasn't the only one to have a turn. The wooden soldiers were marching about, and Dinkey watched them for a while, but they didn't make him want to sing. The Teddy bears were having a meeting—all sitting 'round in a ring—and they looked so solemn that Dinkey couldn't help wanting to chirp a bit to tell them that it couldn't be as bad as all that.

So he pecked the little spot on his soft, bright breast, and off he went, "Chee-chee, Cheer-up!" Then away he hopped, looking so smart and cheerful that all the Teddy bears began to laugh, so they broke up the solemn meeting and did a lovely Bear dance."

The jacket of the volume pictures a galleon laden with precious cargo. That it hints at the rich treasure stored within the volume is manifest when one dips into its pages. To parents and teachers and all friends of children *A Cargo of Stories for Children*—which is delightfully illustrated—should receive a wholesome welcome.

M.

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY

SPRING, 1930

THE NAVAL CONFERENCE

BY GEORGE GLASGOW

THE result of the London naval conference may be known when these lines are published, but they are written before the result is even vaguely foreshadowed. The conference has been sitting for eight weeks. The fact that at the end of so long a period public interest has shifted from figures and categories and is concentrated on the simple issue whether the conference is to break now or whether it can contrive to keep going, gives a true measure of what the world suffers from its politicians. It may be that the politicians assembled in London will not dare go home empty handed; it may even be that before they go they will decide to behave as reasonable men, and will sign a clear, honest treaty for naval reduction. During the first eight weeks of the conference, however, the politicians of one country by their single influence have kept such a treaty at bay. It is the purpose of this paper to interpret what happened during those eight weeks.

It is not a pleasant, but it is a fairly clear, story. The first month of the conference was spent in tactical manœuvring

and in the formulation of views by the various delegations. Every delegation except one held definite views on how the object could be best achieved. The one delegation referred to seemed to specialize in the discovery of reasons why that object could not be achieved. The second month was taken up by a broadside hold-up of the conference by the difficult delegation aforesaid. It will probably emerge from the unadorned chronicle of what took place, given below, that the above summary of the two months' work is not unduly pointed.

A word in passing should perhaps be written in explanation of what may be called the temperamental divergence which constituted the main cause of the disagreement. Before the conference started France had announced (memorandum of December 20th, 1929) that she would not accept any binding undertaking in London, but would regard the work to be done in London as advisory only, the substantive work to be reserved for the League of Nations Disarmament Conference. After the conference started, her tactics were to demand for herself a larger navy than she had ever had, with a sombre disregard of the purpose for which the conference had met; and to use that demand as a lever to extract from the other Powers a new security pact such as had no bearing on that purpose. It would perhaps be improper, however justified it might be on the severe and simple ground of truth, to describe the French method as one of hardly disguised blackmail; but it is at least arguable that propriety in this matter is of less consequence than the danger that resulted from the French unwillingness to abandon militarism as a diplomatic method. The Kellogg Pact proscribed that method. Yet France, although she signed the pact, in effect ignored its meaning.

Expressed in its crude form, the policy persisted in by France up to the eve of the Chequers conversation of March 16th, was that France would not only not reduce her navy, but would even increase it unless the other Powers combined to

promise that they would defend her by arms if she were attacked in the Atlantic or in the Mediterranean. Both Mr. Stimson and Mr. MacDonald refused up to March 16th to consider so preposterous a demand; but the really interesting thing was that M. Tardieu, having entered a conference for the reduction of navies, had the assurance, in defiance of the other four Powers, to turn it, or try to turn it, into a conference for the increase of navies. Does democracy get the politicians it deserves? M. Tardieu probably believed that France, having been invaded twice in a lifetime in spite of her militarist defences, was thereby proved to be right in her faith in those militarist defences. But is the whole of France equally lacking in a sense of logic? And if logic be lacking, need a still more recent history be forgotten? It happens that the efficiency of the opposite philosophy to that of France was recently tested. In January, 1923, the French armies invaded an undefended German territory. The invasion proved to be a farce and a delusion, and the French armies in the following year had to be tamely withdrawn. The only real damage that was done was done to French diplomatic prestige. Public opinion throughout the world made it impossible for France to keep her armies in the Ruhr; and Germany was saved precisely because she was disarmed. Pacifism, whether imposed or voluntary, was proved in that case to be a realistic and effective instrument of security. And is not the undefended frontier, 3,000 miles of it, between Canada and the United States, the best guarantee that there will be no unpleasantness on that frontier?

The difficulty, so far as the London naval conference was concerned, was that France looked backwards to the old method of security by militarist means, whereas the other nations, especially the United States and the British Empire, but not excluding Japan and Italy, were prepared to base their faith in the new method exemplified by the Kellogg Pact.

The first real stumbling block in the work of the conference emerged when the delegates began to discuss submarines. A submarine is a diabolical contrivance of which the only purpose is to approach a ship unseen and then to launch a torpedo at it. Nothing else. M Tardieu was invited to abolish the submarine. He preferred to "humanize" it. There would be as much sense in the Five Powers stipulating by international agreement that a tiger should use its claw in accordance with "the humane rules of existing war," as that a submarine should be used in the same sense. Who after the Great War of 1914-1918 imagines that paper restrictions are quibble-proof in war time? The notion of "humanizing" a submarine is possibly no sillier than that of humanizing a military tank: but no one has ever yet talked of humanizing a tank.

The fact appears to be, and is recognized by every man, woman, and child who has given a moment's thought to the matter, that the humbug of imposing civilized or humanized laws or rules of conduct to war in any form is a dangerous form of mental self-deception. On philosophic grounds there is something to be said for submarines, tanks and poison gas, so long as war is retained as an instrument of human relationship. It is even arguable that the palliatives of war, the Red Cross Organization, the distinction between combatants and non-combatants are an asset for war; whereas frank unmeasured brutality, being the true attribute of war, would conceivably contribute to unloosing the hold of war over the habits of men. By the time London can be wiped out on the pressing of a button in Paris, Berlin or Moscow, war will have killed itself by its own efficiency; but so long as war can be localized, "humanized", toned down and camouflaged; so long as the non-fighting civilians, including the politicians who organize it, can contemplate it from a safe distance, then war is likely to persist as a habit. If it were known absolutely that the moment the next war were declared, the entire surface of each

belligerent country could be inundated with poison gas, and every ship on the sea, merchant ship, passenger ship and war-ship alike could be sunk within an hour, there would be no more war. Even the inhabitants of this world at this time would see the absurdity of it, and would not do it.

M. Tardieu's "humanization" of the submarine became a practical issue after the conference had been sitting for three weeks. The other issues had been defined and narrowed to negotiable dimensions. Mr. MacDonald and Mr. Stimson had demanded the total abolition of the submarine. M. Tardieu held out no hope that France would give up her submarine fleet, the second largest in the world. The French tactic had in it an element of irony. The 1922 treaty about submarines, signed at Washington on February 6th of that year, had been taken down from the shelf, and the French delegation was toying with it. The irony consisted in this, that although France in the persons of MM. Sarrant and Jusserand signed the 1922 treaty in common with the British Empire, the United States, Japan, and Italy, she was the only signatory who had never ratified it. It was France therefore who was responsible for that treaty becoming a dead letter: yet it was France who, rather than accept the further proposal for the abolition of the submarine, now reverted to it as a *pis-aller*. The submarine treaty of 1922 resulted from a proposal made by Senator Elihu Root on behalf of the United States and incorporated in what were known as the "Root Resolutions." The object was defined as "the protection of the lives of neutrals and non-combatants at sea in time of war," the two weapons on which restrictions in the guise of "human rules" were prescribed being poison gas and submarines.

The London conference had been opened in the Royal Gallery of the House of Lords on January 21st, when the King welcomed the delegates in a speech broadcast throughout the world. The personal statistics of the conference would

surprise those who do not know from their experience what a "Five Power" conference may imply. There were 446 delegates at St. James's Palace. There were 342 journalists from 34 different countries. If words were worth their face value, and if there's a way where there's a will, the problem in hand was as good as solved in the Royal Gallery of the House of Lords. It is at any rate fair to cull a phrase from each of those opening speeches so that the chief delegates may be judged at the end of the conference in the light of what they professed at the beginning. After the King had struck the high note ("Since the Great War," he said, "all peoples have determined that human statecraft shall leave nothing undone to prevent a repetition of that grim and immense tragedy"), Mr. MacDonald spoke on behalf of what is technically known as His Majesty's Government in Great Britain. "The whole world," he said, "expects that we shall deliberate and negotiate on the assumption that, having put our names to Pacts of Peace, we mean to respect our signatures. . . . In the naval Powers there is a margin between real security needs and actual or projected strengths, and the world expects this Conference to eliminate that margin."

Mr. Stimson said: "We are ready to stay here until the problems are solved. . . . Our peoples demand of us a success; they recognize the disaster that a failure of this Conference would bring to their dearest hopes, and they are determined that we shall succeed."

M. Tardieu cast a slight shadow when he said: "The solution of such a problem cannot be found by any mathematical formula, because the stress of life shatters all formulae," but before he sat down he professed that "France brings towards the success of the common objective the affirmation both of her goodwill and of her will to succeed."

Signor Grandi declared that "The Fascist Government

is desirous of securing real and tangible results in the field of disarmament and security."

Mr. Reijiro Wakatsuki: "Japan is ready to effect not merely a limitation but an actual reduction in naval strengths, which she considers to be an appropriate and necessary programme of peace, as well as a measure for relieving the nations from onerous financial burdens."

Sir Atul Chatterjee (India), Professor Smiddy (Irish Free State), Mr. T. W. Wilford (New Zealand) and Mr. Te-Water (South Africa) each contributed a pacific pledge.

Now the interesting thing to the plain man was this. The chief delegates had started with the profession of a desire to reach an agreement on naval limitation. Each of the countries they represented had signed two pledges, first the Covenant of the League of Nations ("The High Contracting parties in order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war . . . agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations"), second, the Kellogg Pact ("The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples, that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another"). If the Five Powers had undertaken not to go to war; if they now declared that they wanted to limit naval armaments; why should they not on the morning of January 22nd have proceeded simply to draw up a treaty to that effect? One might as reasonably ask why a neurasthenic man, having nothing to worry about, should not simply stop worrying.

Great Britain at any rate has done something since the war in the reduction of her armaments. On the second day of the conference (January 22nd) Mr. MacDonald broadcasting to the United States, recalled that the personnel of the army

had been reduced by 50,000 compared with 1914, and by 152,000 compared with 1921; in the Navy, compared with 1914, capital ships had been reduced from 69 to 20, cruisers with 8-inch guns from 27 to 11, smaller cruisers from 81 to 43, and submarines from 74 to 53. At the end of the war the Air Force contained 3,300 first line machines, while to-day the number was 772, and "the air fleets of the other great Powers far outnumber us."

It was on the following day that the conference started its detailed business. Each chief delegate was invited to submit a precise statement of the minimum naval "needs" of his country, by which was meant the minimum regarded as necessary for "self-defence" and the protection of trade routes. The resultant statements were somewhat reserved. In the case of Great Britain, as Mr. MacDonald explained, a detailed estimate of needs had already been made public, and he therefore confined himself to a few generalities. The American, Canadian and South African delegates decided not to submit any statement at that stage. Australia and New Zealand drew attention to their peculiar geographical position and the resultant need of naval protection. Signor Grandi's case was easy and simple. He confined himself to postulating an equality with "any other Continental European Power," having in mind, as his hearers knew, no other Power but France.

It was M. Tardieu who made the longest statement. It was full of figures, not of figures of what France demanded in ships, but of statistics on which might reasonably (he submitted) be based a French claim for a larger navy than before. Politicians are often a snare to good causes. M. Tardieu, once the scene had changed from the House of Lords to St. James's Palace, approached the problem of naval limitation as if it were a reparation conference, ships being the divisible spoils; in other words he started by aiming, not at a minimum, but at a maximum number of ships. Humour in such circumstances

is banished. M. Tardieu left his audience with an uneasy feeling that France, participating in a conference on naval reduction, was preparing a case, not for a smaller, but for a bigger navy; a feeling that was later given further justification. On January 23rd M. Tardieu rolled out yards of figures about the length of the French coast; the area, population, length of coast, length of communications, trade-turnover of the French colonial empire; the military needs of France. He claimed that France must "(1) Be able at all times to depend on her navy to ensure her the possibility of transporting the necessary forces from or to any point of her Empire. (2) Be able for the defence of the Mother Country to use at any time her total resources." That took place forty-eight hours after the opening speeches above quoted. *Sunt lacrimae rerum.*

The uppermost controversy that exercised the conference in its first week was this question of the "method" of assessment. It was not a new question. It was first considered by the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference sitting in Geneva in 1926. There emerged two rival hypotheses. One was that of limitation by categories; the other that of limitation by total tonnage. By the first method the maximum tonnage for each category of vessel would be fixed, and the total tonnage would thereby also be fixed. By the second method a total tonnage only would be prescribed, it being left to each Power to distribute its tonnage as it might choose between the various categories. The issue between those who advocated the one method and those who advocated the other became a deadlock by the end of 1926. It was that deadlock that produced the so-called "transactional" or "compromise" proposal, submitted to the Preparatory Commission by M. Paul-Boncour on April 11th, 1927. The proposal simply was that a total tonnage should first be fixed for the navy of each country; that the total tonnage should then be divided among the four categories (capital ships, aircraft-

carriers, surface-vessels of less than 10,000 tons, and submarines); but that each of the contracting parties, while undertaking never to exceed the total tonnage imposed, should have the right to alter the distribution of that tonnage among the categories by transferring tonnage from one category to another, with the sole proviso that before laying down the portion of tonnage to be thus transferred, the transferring Power should give a year's notice to the other contracting Powers. That was the "compromise" in its first blush. It was hardly distinguishable from the method of global limitation, the only practical difference being the giving of a year's notice before a transfer. The new proposal was then improved by the addition of a provision "in principle" restricting the scope of transfer within certain limits to be expressed as a percentage of the category tonnage.

When the third plenary session of the conference was held at St. James's Palace on January 30th Mr. MacDonald stated that so far the delegations had been exchanging views "in order to remove misunderstandings, and in order to pave the way for compromises and agreements." The main interest of what was said at that session lay in the rival theses expounded by M. Tardieu and by Mr. Alexander, First Lord of the British Admiralty. M. Tardieu referred to the so-called French transactional proposal. "The efforts," he said, "of the French Government since 1927 have aimed at rendering this system more supple and more adaptable to the particular needs of all countries."

Mr. Alexander interpreted the British preference for "category" classification. "The British proposals," he said, "for the limitation of naval armaments are based on the category system, on which I think I can say that we find ourselves in complete agreement with the United States of America and with Japan. . . . Nevertheless, we are fully prepared to con-

sider some system embracing the transfer of tonnage provided that this applies only to the less powerful types of ships. . . .”

Signor Grandi proved to be one of the consistently healthy influences at the conference. It is true that his case was simple, that in his desire for parity with France he was on equally firm ground whether he proposed a levelling of Italian strength upwards or downwards; but it was a comfort to hear a delegate who was not afraid of taking every opportunity to talk of reduction rather than limitation. In that respect he took his place beside the American, British and Japanese delegates. The French was the only delegation that claimed a stabilization of strength on a higher plane than that of the *status quo*. In emphasizing the need not only for limitation but for reduction, Signor Grandi made the impressive point (which one would like to hear made much oftener by responsible Italians) that Signor Mussolini's programme of work in Italy necessitated a long period of peace for its execution. Has Signor Mussolini ever said that? On the contrary has he not often said something hardly consistent with it? The more honour to Signor Grandi.

The first week of February was taken up in a discussion of the French transactional plan. The plan itself had been modified since M. Paul-Boncour first launched it. The original four categories had been expanded into six by the splitting of the cruiser category into two, distinguished by 8-inch and by 6-inch guns respectively, and by the addition of a sixth category of special vessels such as minesweepers. At the end of that week, the conference having sat for nearly three weeks, some public impatience began to manifest itself. A measure of the boredom that had begun to pervade the outskirts of the conference was conveyed by the fact that the old story of the American correspondent was again put into currency. It is a remarkable thing that that same story is remembered, and

is duly republished, at every international conference whenever a lull descends upon the proceedings: the story namely of the American correspondent who, on being offered the facts of the situation, declines the offer on the ground that "my paper does not want facts; it wants noos!"

History again repeated itself in the circumstances which preceded a certain sudden publication by Mr. Stimson of an American memorandum of his country's policy. A warped version of the memorandum had leaked out. In self-defence and prematurely Mr. Stimson decided to issue the correct text. It was issued from the Ritz Hotel (American delegation) on the evening of February 6th and caused considerable consternation at the Carlton Hotel (French delegation) the same evening, for it made an offer of immediate parity with Great Britain on a clearly practical basis. The reason for the consternation aforesaid was the fear that Anglo-American agreement should be further consolidated before the subject of submarines, all important to French eyes, was submitted to the conference. It had been decided that the subject of submarines should be submitted to the plenary conference that had been arranged for February 11th.

Mr. Stimson's statement of February 6th was divided into two parts, the first dealing with the United States and Great Britain, the other with the United States and the other parties. Part One started by suggesting "with Great Britain immediate parity in every class of ship in the navy. The gross tonnage of these two fleets is substantially 1,200,000 tons apiece. The negotiations between President Hoover and Prime Minister MacDonald last summer practically reduced the discussion of parity between them to the comparatively insignificant difference in their respective cruiser class tonnage of 24,000 tons. We propose to settle this difference as follows: Under our suggestion the actual tonnage difference between the two cruiser fleets will be only 12,000 tons."

The second part of the memorandum suggested to the Japanese "an over-all relation satisfactory to us, and, we hope, to them in conformity with our relations in the past. It is not based upon the same ratio in every class of ships."

The American statement, explaining as it did the details of a particular stage that had been reached in negotiation was an unusual incident in the practice of diplomacy by conference; but it not only did no harm, but contrived partly to recapture public interest in what was taking place. It was commonly assumed that the statement was due to the direct inspiration of Mr. Hoover, whose anxiety and sincerity were thereby again illumined. The drop on the part of the United States from 21 to 18 cruisers made agreement easier. It had the incidental effect of making M. Tardieu and the Carlton Hotel fight for time, for it was an unfortunate feature of that delegation's tactics that the "transactional" argument should be indefinitely prolonged if for no other purpose than to postpone the discussion of submarines.

Within twenty-four hours Mr. MacDonald responded with a statement of British views. It was not a new statement. It had been drafted soon after the beginning of the conference as a text upon which the British delegation based its policy, and was now published in a friendly spirit of competitive frankness with the United States. The cheerful element in that competition was the growing convergence of British and American views. The British policy was already well known, and the content of the memorandum of February 7th need not be summarized here.

It almost inevitably happens that when two parties at a conference tend to agree, the other parties tend to assume a defensive attitude based on a nervous assumption that the "agreement" may be directed against themselves. In this case the nervous party was France. Neither Italy nor Japan gave any evidence of anything except pleasure that a move was at

last being made. M. Tardieu, however, according to a report given by M. Géraud (Pertinax) in the *Écho de Paris*, took steps to acquaint Mr. MacDonald of his "astonishment" at being presented with the accomplished fact of an Anglo-American agreement about which he had no previous inkling; and it was suggested in Paris that the reason why the conference had been delayed during the past fortnight was now clear, namely that Mr. Stimson and Mr. MacDonald had been concocting their secret agreement.

When tempers are frayed, however, the Russian delegation (if any) can nearly always be depended on to supply the comic relief. When no Russian delegation happens to be present, the Moscow press can nearly always be relied upon to fill the gap. In this case what could have been neater than the way in which *Izvestia* rose to the occasion? France had become jumpy about an alleged Anglo-American understanding; the obvious antidote was to make America jumpy about an Anglo-French understanding. The writer of the *Izvestia* article began by referring to the "transactional" plan as an Anglo-French plan, and incidentally as a "victory for French militarism and pseudo-Socialism" (a hit at M. Paul-Boncour). The writer then made this delicious diagnosis: "This new London compromise is only the beginning. England will only be reconciled to the serious growth of the French fleet if it can regard this fleet not as a possible enemy but as a possible ally in any future clash. But America, with the greatest interest and suspicion, follows every manifestation of Anglo-French rapprochement. A thick cloud of intrigues and contradictions surrounds the Conference's first steps."

Possibly as a result of M. Tardieu's anxiety, which had not been wholly allayed by the tonic from Moscow, Mr. MacDonald made a statement in the House of Commons on February 10th in the course of which he declared that: "I should like to make it clear that this memorandum,, which

indicates our policy, has not been drawn up in agreement with any other delegation.”

The fourth plenary session of the conference was duly held on February 11th. Mr. Alexander submitted to it the case for the abolition of the submarine. He quoted the experience of the Great War in support of his contention that submarines are useless for defence but powerful in attack. He further embellished his argument by suggesting that if the submarine were an effective defensive instrument, then Great Britain would stand to benefit by it more than any country. Yet the British proposal was to abolish it. “The Powers here represented,” he said, “have built, are building, or have authorized over 400 of these vessels designed for submarine warfare. They are expensive in maintenance, they have most complicated machinery, and a very high proportion of skilled personnel is required to man them. They are very expensive to build. They require extensive provision in the way of shore establishments and depôt ships to maintain them. Their abolition would in itself, therefore, achieve an enormous reduction in armaments’ expenditure. But the saving would not end there. Indirectly, such a decision as we urge would accomplish almost equally large savings in the provision of destroyers and anti-submarine units—so immediate, that if the Conference agreed to abolish the submarine, we could immediately sit down together to reduce the figures under this head. The total economy would therefore be enormous.”

In the alternative, said Mr. Alexander, Great Britain would “endeavour to confine the submarine to defence by limiting it strictly, both in size and in numbers. In that connection we should be prepared to accept the lowest possible limits than can be suggested, again both in numbers and size. We should also propose to the Conference that if submarines are to be retained, most definite conditions should be laid down and agreed upon, with a view to preventing these vessels from

being used as commerce destroyers in violation of international law and practice, and the standards of conduct which public opinion most certainly demands. To that end we should seek to revive the agreement signed at Washington on February 6th, 1922, but which was not fully ratified by the Signatory Powers, to regulate the attack on merchant ships by submarines, in accordance with the rules and practice set out in that Treaty."

Mr. Stimson then explained the change that had taken place since 1922 in the American view of submarines, America being now in favour of abolition. "The argument that the submarine is a purely defensive weapon (he said) seems to us difficult to reconcile with the offensive use which has been made of it at great distances from its home ports. Furthermore, I feel that there is a very weighty argument in the fact that the construction and maintenance of submarines impose upon all navies higher levels in those classes of ships which are used against their submarines—namely, destroyers and light cruisers. The essential objection to the submarine is that it is a weapon particularly susceptible to abuse, that it is susceptible of use against merchant ships in a way that violates alike the laws of war and the dictates of humanity. The use made of the submarine revolted the conscience of the world, and the threat of its unrestricted use against merchant ships was what finally determined the entry of my own country into the conflict. In the light of our experience it seems clear that in any future war those who employ the submarine will be under strong temptation, perhaps irresistible temptation, to use it in the way that is most effective for immediate purposes regardless of consequences."

Admiral Takarabe joined issue with Mr. Stimson. He opposed the proposal for the abolition on the ground that the submarine is a legitimate instrument of defence, although it could be misused, as indeed could aeroplanes; but Japan, he

concluded, "is second to none in giving her full support to an undertaking to outlaw the illegitimate use of a legitimate and defensive agency of war."

Signor Grandi deepened the good impression he had already made by submitting a short statement thus: "The Italian Delegation share the view that at the present stage of the problem a discussion on the abolition of submarines would be in the interest of disarmament. We do not object in principle to the abolition of submarines if all the naval Powers concur therein, and if such an abolition is to exert a decisive influence in bringing about that drastic reduction of armaments which the whole world desires."

France, in the person of M. Leygues, of course, rejected the Anglo-American proposal. "The submarine," he said, "works by surprise; it lies in wait for the enemy, but has ambush ever been excluded from warfare? It hides under water, but does not the surface ship sometimes try to hide behind a screen of smoke? It attacks other warships without warning but does the most powerfully armed surface ship wait to open fire till she herself is within range of her opponent?" He ended a long speech by declaring on behalf of the French delegation that "1. They cannot accept the abolition of the submarine. (2) They are ready to concur in an international agreement regulating the use of the submarine."

Thus did the conference register its first disagreement. It was commonly assumed that because France and Japan were not disposed to abolish the submarine, the submarine could not be abolished. It could at best be only "humanized." The buffoonery of that word had by now become acclimatized in St. James's Palace.

During the rest of the week following the fourth plenary session, public interest in the conference was rapidly deflated. The moral capital with which the conference had started had been largely wasted by the ill-concealed scepticism of the

French delegation. It was found tiresome even by the most unconquerable enthusiasts to continue an analysis of rival memoranda and figures of which the purport, in so far as they had any purport at all, was obscurantist and destructive. When M. Tardieu returned to Paris for his usual week-end and did not come back because he was beaten in the French Chamber on the Monday (February 17th), public opinion throughout the world was relieved rather than disappointed.

M. Tardieu duly constituted his new ministry in the early hours of Sunday, March 2nd, and the Naval Conference was able to resume its work in the week then beginning. While M. Tardieu had been in the wilderness, Signor Grandi (February 19th) had in his turn submitted a detailed statement of the Italian attitude to the conference, but for all its statistics it added nothing new to what was already known. The essential point of the Italian case remained a demand for parity with any other continental power. Before the full conference was resumed there was some desultory talk of a three-Power naval pact, Italy being ruled out because her policy was directly related to the policy of France; but the talk did not produce anything tangible. What did result was a softening of American rigidity about 8-inch guns, whereby the problem of naval limitation, so far at any rate as the three chief naval Powers were concerned, was pulled further within negotiable scope. Any rejoicings there might have been were, however, darkened by the shadow of France. When on March 7th the French delegation, headed by M. Briand, again took part in the work, the immediate effect was an almost total cessation of that work by reason of the renewed stalking of an old French bogey. Mr. MacDonald had made no secret of his dissatisfaction with the condition of stalemate that had descended on the conference. He was anxious to finish the conference before April 14th, the projected day of the British Budget, his incidental concern being to have some specific

five-Power commitment to naval reduction such as might ease the burden on the British taxpayer. France, however, is a rich country, the second richest in the world after the United States, made rich by the World War and its aftermath, because the British taxpayer is paying French war expenses and because concurrently German reparations are going mainly to Paris. One heard it argued unofficially in the Carlton Hotel, by a person of serious standing in the French delegation, that the United States and France being enriched and Great Britain impoverished by the War, it would be logical on the part of Great Britain, having for that reason granted parity to the United States, to grant it for the same reason to France. Was this a naval disarmament conference? Or was it, in the warped mind of post-war France, a manoeuvring for position in a bigger war than ever? One need not be alarmed; for the next 60 years Great Britain will be much too poor to pay for the next French war; and France is much too sensible to engage in war at her own expense.

During the week-end March 9th-11th M. Briand held certain discussions with Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Henderson, Mr. Stimson and other members of the American delegation. He is one of the most genuinely pacific men in Europe, but he is a square peg in a round hole. He talked in London under instructions from Paris; his instruction was not to talk for the moment about naval reduction but to engage in the form of subtle blackmail above alluded to, to extract from the other four Powers still another of those security pacts for which France pines. M. Briand therefore, while prefacing his submission with the axiom that war between the five Powers was unthinkable, proceeded to urge that the five Powers should enter into a pact for mutual assistance in case of war. The League of Nations Covenant, the Kellogg Pact, the Locarno Treaties were not enough, even though at that very moment a committee of 11 persons was sitting in Geneva engaged in

the work of harmonizing the League Covenant with the Kellogg Pact. There was no ground for any expectation on the part of France that the United States would enter into such a commitment. There was every ground for assurance that Great Britain would not enter into it. Yet M. Briand had to raise it, and in raising it had to distract the conference from its real business.

On Sunday night, March 9th, Mr. MacDonald broadcast to America a statement which, for all the optimism of its tone, had something of a sting in it. He started thus: "You ask me 'What of the night, watchman?' and I call across to you 'All is well.' " But he soon showed that all was not well. He said: "We shall not agree to base any treaty which may result from this conference on entangling military alliances. That would undo in spirit and in policy the work of the conference. But some of us will strive to secure as an essential part of the agreement a pledge of goodwill and pacific intention similar to that made by the President (i.e. President Hoover) and myself after we had convinced ourselves that a naval agreement was possible. The bonds of war are not and cannot be the security of peace. Such a pledge ought to allow programmes to be reduced to a minimum, if we have any confidence in each other's signatures. Our two delegations (i.e. the British and the American) are on the highway to eliminating our own differences, and are co-operating most cordially in negotiation with the other Powers to overcome difficulties and to build up step by step a naval agreement which will reduce building programmes, abolish competition, put an end to distrust and menace, and create an equilibrium in strength which will bring tranquillity to the minds of the nations and lead to further results in the process of disarmament."

As this paper is written, the conference still faces M. Tardieu's pistol: the pistol behind which he demands an armed

alliance for France. At the moment, however, he has taken his finger from the trigger. If this narrative be fated to be read in the pleasanter light of a successful ending to the conference, the reader will have a better stomach for the history of the first eight weeks; but that history has its value, whatever the result.

THE LAST RISING

BY

SIR ANDREW MACPHAIL

A MELODRAMA

Persons: MRS. NAIRN.

A GIRL, her grandchild.

A BOY, her grandchild.

HUGH, her son.

CAMPBELL, an old man.

SCENE: *In Canada. On the grass, a tea-table with rustic chairs, under a wide awning extending from the wall of a large kitchen at the right, having two windows and a door. Trees on the left; hills in the distance.*

Mrs. Nairn. This must be Tuesday.

Boy. [*Splicing a rope.*] Yes, Grandma; Tuesday.

Mrs. Nairn. To-morrow will be Wednesday; and the week gone. What day of the month is it?

Boy. [*Consulting a newspaper.*] 1914, August 4th.

Mrs. Nairn. The summer is passing. You will soon be going away.

Girl. [*Laying down a book.*] I am afraid, Grandma, we have been a lot of trouble to you.

Mrs. Nairn. Less trouble as the years go by. You are good children, and growing in sense.

Girl. How many years have we been coming here?

Mrs. Nairn. Twelve alone, and one with your mother.

Girl. Then, I could have been only two years old, when I came to this pretty place for the first time. I hardly remember.

Mrs. Nairn. That would make you fifteen last spring.

Girl. Why do you not come and live with us?

Mrs. Nairn. I shall finish my life where it began—in sight of the hills.

Boy. But you would have more comfort.

Mrs. Nairn. I did spend one winter in your town. It was too dull: no food in the cellar; an empty cupboard; no animals with their need of me,—with their trust, affection, silence. Animals do not talk. It is talk that tires one.

Boy. [*To Girl.*] That is what I am always telling you.

Mrs. Nairn. Not children's talk: you say what is in your minds.

Girl. We could talk to you, and listen, all winter.

Mrs. Nairn. The young must speak with the young. I make my own winter; the spring makes itself; you make my summer.

Boy. It is uncle Hugh; he is so much to all of us.

Mrs. Nairn. I have him only in the summer. I am content. You are with him the year round.

Girl. If we are any good, it was he who brought us up.

Mrs. Nairn. You are a credit to him; and to me too. [*Enter Hugh in dressing-gown from kitchen*].

Hugh. Mother, what did you do with the jacket that was lying on my bed?

Mrs. Nairn. The one with the crown embroidered on the cuff?

Hugh. Yes,—and the breeches, and the other things?

Mrs. Nairn. I hung them out to air on the maple tree. I was afraid of the moths and the mould.

Hugh. The moths and the mould are not likely to trouble them for some time to come. [*Exit to left*].

Mrs. Nairn. What are those queer clothes?

Girl. They are uniform.

Mrs. Nairn. But, only soldiers wear uniform. He is not a soldier; and in my time soldiers always wore red.

Girl. They call it khaki now.

Mrs. Nairn. And those long strips, like the selvedge of a web?

Girl. Those are puttees.

Mrs. Nairn. What does he do with them?

Girl. He wraps them around his legs, like gaiters.

Mrs. Nairn. But what does he mean, dressing up like that? He is a professor. He has been acting strange all summer.

Girl. He is a professor of engineering, and a Sapper, too.

Mrs. Nairn. What is a Sapper? It sounds like the name of a dog.

Girl. I do not know; but all his students are Sappers.

Boy. That is what they call an engineer in the Army. I shall join his company of Sappers when I go to Queen's in September.

Mrs. Nairn. The University is not the Army.

Boy. It will be,—if war breaks out.

Mrs. Nairn. Will he have to go to any war?

Boy. He may not have to go; but he will go. And I shall go with him.

Mrs. Nairn. No war will ever come to this quiet place amongst the hills and lakes. You have been reading things in the books. Both of you are always reading books. [*To Girl.*] What book is that you are reading?

Girl. It is called *The Oxford Book of English Verse*.

Mrs. Nairn. Read me a piece where the book opens.

Girl. [*Reads*]:

It is not to be thought of that the flood
Of British freedom, which, to the open sea

Of the world's praise, from dark antiquity
Hath flow'd

Boy. Let me see that book. [*Takes the book, and reads to himself.*] That is true, although it is poetry.

Mrs. Nairn. I do not understand all this talk of war and freedom. We have always been free without any war. There will be no more war,—except in the newspapers.

Girl. You were reading last Sabbath about Armageddon.

Mrs. Nairn. You must not take the Bible too seriously. It refers to spiritual warfare between good and evil.

Hugh. [*Enters from left, carrying cap, clothes, boots, and belt.*] I am afraid I shall be leaving you.

Mrs. Nairn. Where are you going in such haste?

Hugh. Far and long.

Mrs. Nairn. Not to the War,—when there is no war.

Hugh. It looks like it.

Mrs. Nairn. I knew there was something on your mind. But who is sending you?

Hugh. Myself alone.

Mrs. Nairn. That is the way the old people talked.—and sang. [*Sings*]:

Tha tighinn fodham, fodham, fodham,
Tha tighinn fodham, eirich . . . The
Time has come for us to rise.

Hugh. We always knew the time to rise.

Mrs. Nairn. It is not for me to say. You know best, Dear,—Dear—.

Hugh. This is not the first time your people have risen.

Mrs. Nairn. And always fell.

Girl. [*Reading.*] We must be free or die. [*Exit left, in sudden terror. Boy follows*].

Mrs. Nairn. If you are going away, we must tell the children about their father.

Hugh. What shall we tell them?

Mrs. Nairn. The truth.

Hugh. How can we tell them the truth when we ourselves do not know what the truth is?

Mrs. Nairn. We only know that Hector disappeared, twelve years ago.

Hugh. And that the Bonds were missing from the vault. That was the year their mother died; his mind was confused.

Mrs. Nairn. No son of mine ever took those Bonds.

Hugh. Who did? He was manager of the Bank.

Mrs. Nairn. The customer was a miser; he is a rich old miser yet.

Hugh. Why would the miser steal his own bonds?

Mrs. Nairn. Why did the black bird carry off my gold thimble?

Hugh. And you found the thimble after fifteen years. If I knew the truth I should tell the children.

Mrs. Nairn. You need not disturb yourself. The Boy knows as much as we do.

Hugh. What makes you think so?

Mrs. Nairn. Because he has never asked about his father. The thoughts of the young are deep thoughts, and their hearts secret.

Hugh. Or if I were quite sure that Hector is dead, I should say nothing to them.

Mrs. Nairn. Have you the slightest hope that he is alive?

Hugh. Twice a year, ever since he left, twelve years ago, a bank-draft for a thousand dollars has come to me from a Trust Company in the States. I have invested the whole amount in their joint names. Either he is alive and earns the money; or he is

dead, and this is the interest on the Bonds. Two thousand dollars a year is five per cent. on forty thousand dollars; that is the exact amount that was missing at the time.

Mrs. Nairn. Could you not write to the Trust Company?

Hugh. I did write,—once.

Mrs. Nairn. What did they say?

Hugh. They said they could give no information; and that if any further enquiry were made, the payments would stop.

Mrs. Nairn. Then there is nothing more to be done: nothing to be said. Will this be a big war?

Hugh. It is big enough now.

Mrs. Nairn. Then you will see Hector where you are going. He too will know the time to rise. He will clear himself yet.

Hugh. The children are coming back. In any event, they are provided for; and you,—as always. [*Exit by kitchen with burden. Enter Boy and Girl*].

Boy. I was showing her where to bestow the canoes for the winter. I am afraid I will not have the time.

Mrs. Nairn. Good Land! You are not going too?

Boy. I am thinking it is time for me to rise.

Tha tighinn fodham eirich!

Mrs. Nairn. That is foolish talk in the mouth of an English-speaking child. [*A sound of knocking.*] Come in.

Boy. You mean, come out.

Campbell. [*Enters from kitchen.*] I knocked on the front-door. Himself called to me to come in; but I was seeing no one.

Mrs. Nairn. He must be in his room.

Campbell. I came through the house; and here I am, outside once more.

Mrs. Nairn. The children must always be in the sun.

Boy. It makes us strong.

Campbell. He is a strong boy. [*Feeling his ribs.*] They say, he is solid bone on both sides.

Mrs. Nairn. He works hard enough.

Campbell. When he swings the ax in the woods, I can hear the blows as far as my own house.

Mrs. Nairn. But they are so sun-burned.

Campbell. That is a good girl, and a pretty girl, although she is black as an Indian. You would think she might carry a parasol, having nothing else to do.

Mrs. Nairn. I cannot even keep her in the house. It is nothing but the woods, the lake, and the river.

Campbell. If they had to lift grain, and plant potatoes in the burnt-field, as we did, when we were young, they would get all the sun they want, and work, too.

Girl. That would only be exercise.

Campbell. If you could not stop when you liked, you would call it work.

Mrs. Nairn. I am afraid you came on some business. We do not often see you on a *ceilidh*.

Campbell. With a train morning and evening, and the telephone, I have not much time for friendly visits.

Mrs. Nairn. You may have something for ourselves. Who can have sent it?

Campbell. Here is a telephone message for the Professor. It calls him Major. I suppose he is the same.

Mrs. Nairn. What does it say?

Campbell. I am not very sure. I took it down as well as I could. Perhaps he will understand it. It was telephoned from the telegraph office in Renfrew [*Reads.*] It is from G.O.C. whoever he is, and

from Military District Number 3, wherever that may be.

Boy. That will be Kingston.

Campbell. They want him to come at once; they are not very polite about it either. You would think they were calling a horse from the pasture.

Boy. Had I not better take the message to uncle Hugh?

Campbell. There is no such hurry as all that. I must explain it to him. My writing is not very good. I can hardly read it myself.

Mrs. Nairn. You will be the better for a cup of tea after your walk. When you finish, Hugh will have come. [*Exit to kitchen, and returns with fresh tea. Boy takes up the book and reads.*] I am sorry this is not something stronger; but times have changed.

Campbell. Not in many places am I offered as much as that. —For these mercies—and kind friends—thank God.

Mrs. Nairn. [*Pouring tea.*] I am afraid it is not drawn enough.

Campbell. The second cup may be better. [*Drinks.*] These tin pots make poor tea.

Mrs. Nairn. That pot is silver.

Campbell. It comes to the same thing; but they do not break as easy as the brown ones.

Mrs. Nairn. Were they saying anything in the town about the war?

Campbell. I could not hear very well; but they said it would make good prices.

Boy. Why good prices?

Campbell. I remember in the time of the American War, potatoes were a dollar a bushel, wheat two dollars, white pine, sixty dollars a thousand.

Mrs. Nairn. You were in the American War, yourself?

Campbell. I was that. My uncle, who lived in the States, enlisted me, and kept the bounty of 800 dollars,—rogue that he was, although he was my own uncle.

Girl. You could not have been very old?

Campbell. I was not the age of that boy. It is boys they get. Men have too much sense, unless they expect to be officers, or are no good at home.

Boy. Would they take me?

Campbell. They will take you quick enough.

Mrs. Nairn. Not a child like him!

Campbell. If you are thinking of going to the War, bring a blanket, and lie out in the field in the cold and the rain, with some bread and meat for your food. You will have enough of war at the end of the night.

Mrs. Nairn. But he might be killed.

Campbell. There would be a thousand dollars coming to his sister.

Girl. No, no. Do not speak of it.

Campbell. And if he is wounded, he will have a good pension. I have twelve dollars a month myself for nothing. [*To Boy.*] If you are shot through the middle, you will crawl behind a fence. You will take a drink of water from your bottle. If the water does not run out through the hole, keep on crawling. If it does run out, you need go no further. That is what I did, myself.

Boy. But there is the glory of war.

Campbell. For an officer,—perhaps. For the boys,—no. Me, I am not going to any more wars. But I must be on the road. There is no one to answer the telephone.

Mrs. Nairn. There may be messages for others.

Campbell. Not for any one around here. These imported people, foreign folk, are too cautious for that. But here he is, himself. [*Enter Hugh in Major's uniform*].

Hugh. You have a message?

Campbell. Then you were expecting it?

Hugh. For four years. [*Reads.*] It has come at last.

Mrs. Nairn. But where is the war?

Hugh. In France.

Campbell. And are we to fight the French again? They were saying in the town it was the Belgians or some other foreigners.

Hugh. It is the Germans this time.

Campbell. The Germans fought the French before, and beat them. I remember that very well. The Germans are dangerous people.

Mrs. Nairn. What have we to do with them?

Hugh. The Germans have come into Belgium on the way to France.

Campbell. Are they all neighbours, then?

Hugh. Yes; and our neighbours too, if they come too far.

Campbell. It is a foolish business, interfering in a dispute between neighbours. Let them fight it out. Then we can come in. That is the way old Myers got the Front farm.

Boy. Are you really going to the War, uncle Hugh?

Hugh. Yes; now; to-day.

Boy. Will you take me?

Hugh. I will not take you. But if you decide for yourself, you can go in my Company.

Boy. I shall go.

Hugh. With me, now, to-day?

Boy. Will this be a short war?

Hugh. Yes,—if we wish to be beaten.

- Boy.* Will it be a long war?
- Hugh.* Yes,—if we want to destroy ourselves as well as the Germans.
- Boy.* Will it be a very long war?
- Hugh.* Yes,—if we have patience enough to allow the Germans to destroy themselves.
- Boy.* How long is a very long war?
- Hugh.* This is a great war; and no great war has ever lasted less than seven years; but the first four years are always the worst.
- Boy.* Then they can wait for me until the morning. I must put my things away, and take down my tent. I shall join you in the town.
- Hugh.* Your papers will be ready. Think it over in the night.
- Mrs. Nairn.* I think of the company he will fall into. In the army there are bad men.
- Hugh.* There are bad men in the university.
- Campbell.* I suppose both places are alike. You need have no fear. The boy that is righteous will be righteous still; he who is filthy will be filthy still,—as the Bible itself says.
- Boy.* [*Embarrassed.*] Is that a sword on the table?
- Hugh.* Look for yourself.
- Boy.* It is not very sharp.
- Hugh.* We can sharpen it.
- Boy.* I can turn the stone, as I do for the scythe.
- Hugh.* That will be a new use for the old grind-stone.
- Campbell.* But who will gather the harvest when the sword takes the place of the scythe? The wheat is in head, and the oats turning.
- Hugh.* There will be plenty left to gather the harvest,—if they get their money at the end of the day.

Campbell. Farming and the other business of the country must be carried on.

Hugh. And my pay will provide wages for this year at least. Next year? Who can tell?

Mrs. Nairn. I have not yet forgotten how to lift a sheaf, myself.

Campbell. A long war, you are saying. Then I shall break up the five-acre field, and risk five tons of fertilizer. That will cost a hundred dollars; but war makes good prices, although it breaks up my pretty field.

Mrs. Nairn. And breaks women's hearts.

Girl. Even whilst their hearts are filled with pride of their men. You and I will carry on until they return. I shall do my best.

Mrs. Nairn. [*Walking apart.*] Hector will see his boy; his boy will bring him home to me.

Boy. [*To Girl.*] What did I tell you in the woods, when we were putting the canoes away?

Girl. You were right.

Mrs. Nairn. Good children, war, as well as peace, is of God.

Campbell. I think, myself, war is of the evil One; but if you are going to talk like that, I had better take the Books. I can do that much, whatever. Himself is not a praying man. And you will never see the one or the other again. If they are not killed, they will be drowned. They are going across the sea.

Mrs. Nairn. [*Exit to kitchen, and returns with the Book open at the place; throws a scarf over the Girl's head, whose hair is cut short.*] Here is the Book.

Campbell. The 46th Psalm. [*Stands, and intones.*] God is our refuge and our strength.

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY

[*All stand and sing.*] God is our refuge and our strength.

Campbell. [*Intones.*] In straits our present aid.
[*All sing.*] In straits our present aid.

—————
Curtain falls slowly.

The musical score is written for two parts: a vocal part (Cantata) and a piano accompaniment. The key signature is one flat (B-flat), and the time signature is 4/2. The score is divided into two systems. The first system is for the song 'God is our refuge and our strength'. The vocal part begins with a treble clef and a key signature of one flat. The piano part begins with a bass clef and a key signature of one flat. The second system is for the song 'In straits our present aid'. The vocal part begins with a treble clef and a key signature of one flat. The piano part begins with a bass clef and a key signature of one flat. The lyrics are written below the notes.

Campbell
God is our refuge and our strength

All
God is our ref-uge and our strength

Campbell
In straits our pre-sent aid

All
In straits our pre-sent aid

NIETZSCHE

BY BARKER FAIRLEY

THERE is in Nietzsche's writings a rare kind of truthfulness. It is not truthfulness, however, in the sense of ultimate truth, for Nietzsche never sought ultimate truth, and when he considered the possibility of it he doubted its value. Nor, if we hold that this ultimate truth is attainable, shall we be likely to count Nietzsche among those who touched it most nearly. We shall scarcely accord him a place with Sophocles, Shakespeare, or Goethe or any of those who "saw life steadily, and saw it whole." Yet there is in him a quality of mind which the greatest of these might have envied him—a certain vigilance and perspicacity which guarded him at all times from intellectual hypocrisy and even made such hypocrisy impossible.

It is not easy, indeed it is impossible, to find a suitable parallel. One thinks of the conspicuous honesty of Lessing, of the scrupulousness of Pascal, or of the quiet integrity of a minor writer like Mark Rutherford, yet all of these preserved their unusual sincerity of mental life by a studied coolness or an instinctive reserve. Either they were not full-natured men or their natures were guarded. The light of their intellect was clear, but there was a hand that sheltered it and kept it from wavering. Nietzsche takes no such precautions. Of all philosophical minds known to us his is the most "dangerous", the most athletic, the swiftest in pace, the least shielded in action. He is philosophy's Hotspur and he is its Icarus. For more than twenty years he took every mental hazard he saw and the hazards grew more desperate as he proceeded. Yet throughout that time—or with rare exceptions only—he displayed a frankness, a clarity, a cleanliness, almost a chastity

of intellect which is probably unsurpassed in the history of man. He came by it early and he kept it to the end. In his very last writings, when the laughter of insanity is already audible behind his breathless sentences, his intellectual morality remains untainted, so that even the abandoned and almost ululating testamentary outburst which he called *Ecce Homo* compels us to recognize at once a passion and a genius for truthfulness which saints of old time have prayed for upon their knees and not been vouchsafed.

"There is a kind of candour," he writes, "which is foreign to all founders of religion and such like—they have never made of their experiences an affair of conscience for their intellects. What did I really experience? What was it then that went on in me and about me? Was my reason clear enough? Was my will turned against all deception of the senses and valiant to ward off the fantastic? Such questions none of them has asked, nor do these dear religious people ask them even now. They have a thirst for things contrary to reason and wish to satisfy it without too much effort—and so they experience 'miracles' and 'rebirths' and hear the voices of angels. But we, we who are thirsty for reason, we wish to scrutinize our experiences, like a scientific experiment, hour by hour, day by day. We want to be our own experiments and experimental material."

This coupled with his ardent self-definition in lyrical verse gives more than a hint of his central quality,

Yes, I know from whence I come,
Unsated like flame
I glow and am consumed.
All that I touch turns to light,
All that I leave turns ashes.
Flame I surely am.

And one more passage which displays both of the other qualities, with a touch of his characteristic irony at the close.

“I experience it again and again and resist it every time; I refuse to believe it, though the proof stares me in the face, that most people have no intellectual conscience. Indeed, it has often seemed to me that if you look for this you can find our biggest cities as lonely as the desert. Everyone looks blankly at you and goes on weighing with his balance, calling this good and that bad. None blushes, when you show him that his weights are not true. Nor does it arouse any animosity. Perhaps he laughs at your doubts. My meaning is that most people do not find it despicable to believe this or that and to live accordingly without having first entered into the final and infallible reasons for and against and without giving themselves the trouble to seek them afterwards—the most gifted men and the noblest women belong to this majority. But what is kindness, refinement, or genius to me if the man who is possessed of these virtues tolerates lazy feelings in himself in point of faith and judgment, if he does not esteem the desire for certainty as his deepest craving and his most intimate need—the thing which distinguishes the higher man from the lower. I found in certain pious ones a hatred of reason and was grateful to them for it, for this at least betrayed the intellectual conscience reversed (*‘das böse intellektuale Gewissen’*). But to stand in the midst of this *‘rerum concordia discors’* and all the amazing uncertainty and ambiguity of existence and not to ask, not to tremble with the desire and the joy of asking, not even to hate him that asks, perhaps even to take a dull pleasure in him—that is what I feel to be despicable. And this feeling is what I look for first in everyone. Some foolishness in me persuades me over and over again that everyone has this feeling, being man. This is my kind of injustice.”

The form in which Nietzsche's works are cast is an exact reflection of this philosophical honesty, this immaculateness, at its intensest and purest. He writes for preference in the form of short statements, a sentence or a paragraph, each of

which turns upon a single thought or a brief argument or a transient state of mind. The *Fröhliche Wissenschaft*, one of his finest volumes, is composed of 383 such aphorisms. This unsystematic way of writing is usually ascribed to Nietzsche's prevailing ill-health, which, beginning with an illness acquired during service as a Red Cross helper in the war of 1870, allowed him to work only intermittently. But this is an unsatisfactory explanation. We have no convincing evidence that defective health makes for brevity of workmanship. We do not find that the writers of long novels and memoirs are nimrods or the writers of fables invalids. The reverse is just as likely to be true, even more likely, since the briefer forms of literature are usually the more strenuous and it is notoriously easier to continue a work once begun than to begin a brand-new work at every sitting, which is what Nietzsche virtually did.

It was not ill-health that made Nietzsche write in aphorisms. He would have written thus if his strength had been the strength of ten; or he would have been well advised to write so. For the way he wrote was perfectly suited to his genius. It was his business on earth, his destiny, to speak his thoughts clean and untrammelled, to eliminate all bias and prejudice that was not inherently and actively his, to dismiss all forms of intellectual interference, and then to let his mind say what it was prompted to say. This lyrical thinking—for that is what it amounts to and it must not be confounded with rhapsody—is incompatible with sustained composition. The writers of long works must let this virtue go by the board and rely on other virtues. For what writer of a continuous composition is as free to write his second paragraph as he was to write his first? The first paragraph, let us say, is his; the second is a compromise between him and the first, which was his when he wrote it, but now confronts him as a thing extraneous to himself. And when he comes to the end of his book

he is, as likely as not, the victim of his own creation, a martyr to the machine that he has made, a slave chained to his galley. And where then is Nietzsche's unimpeded mental freedom and untarnished purity of intellect? No, if Nietzsche had written systematically he would have obscured his crowning gift.

It will be clear that the Nietzsche presented thus far is not the Nietzsche of *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, the long quasi-imaginative dithyrambic work by which he is best known. Whatever *Zarathustra's* merits—and they are enough to establish it securely among the momentous things in modern literature—they are not the merits which constitute Nietzsche's chief claim upon our attention.

Let it be freely conceded that Nietzsche wrote *Zarathustra* at the height of his power. It was in the years 1883, 4, and 5, when he was about 40 years old. He had more than a dozen years of authorship behind him. The two books which immediately preceded and followed *Zarathustra* have to be recognized as consummate in their kind, *Die Fröhliche Wissenschaft* ("The Glad Science") for a kind of emancipated serenity, which makes it the most lovable of his volumes, and *Beyond Good and Evil*, than which he has written nothing more trenchant and challenging. If we read the whole series of aphoristic books prior to *Zarathustra* we can even detect a musical crescendo, beginning with the cool, critical, negative, scientific aphorisms of *Human, All-too-Human* and culminating in the warm and buoyant pages of the *Sanctus Januarius*. And in all that follows *Zarathustra*, prior to the tragic breakdown of this superlative intellect we must recognize an access of force, a reserve of ammunition, an artillery of mental power, surpassing anything in the earlier period. There is everything in the succession of his works to prove to us that *Zarathustra* had to come, that it was in the nature of a climax, and that the writing of it was beneficial to its author.

And yet, admitting that this work or something like it was inevitable, did Nietzsche manage himself at this crisis with his usual sureness? Did he know himself with his wonted clarity? Probably not. Or he would never have consented to write in disguise, to discard the direct first person, Friedrich Nietzsche, and to speak through the artificial mouthpiece of a Biblical Zarathustra. For it was essential to Nietzsche's individual genius to speak without mask, let, or hindrance, to keep his mental life clear and unequivocal, and to shun the enigmatic. In this light any disguise was a mistake, yet he elected one and abode by it till it had served its purpose.

To understand his choice of means, it is necessary to remember that from the time when ill-health compelled him to retire prematurely from academic life he had lived in peculiar isolation. Nor was the loneliness of his private life, as he moved from this place to that in the Riviera and Italy in search of health, relieved by any whisper of public recognition. The silence that hung about his printed works grew heavier as their power and importance, in our present view, became manifest. Nietzsche was not among those persons who crave undue friendship and recognition. Does he not proudly say in *Zarathustra*: "We lose our understanding of men if we are too much with them. There is too much foreground to them all"? Yet he was not one of the supremely self-sufficient who are willing to step out their life's journey unaccompanied. Besides he had or believed he had a message to deliver.

In some such way we can see his legitimate desire for an adequate hearing, intensified beyond its natural pitch by his abnormal isolation, leading him to address a wider public than he really cared for and resorting to a more popular mode of expression, the biblical, than was compatible with his better genius. When, early in the volume, he writes, "A light was shown to me. Let not Zarathustra speak to the people, but

to comrades. Zarathustra shall not become shepherd and sheep-dog to the herd. To entice many away from the herd—that was why I came. The people and the herd shall be wroth with me. The shepherds will call Zarathustra a robber,”—when he writes this he is giving a convincing reason for stopping his book, or, at least, for returning to his natural manner, but instead of this he retains the assumed manner to the end and makes it, with a curious discrepancy, the vehicle for his most esoteric doctrines. To put the case as favourably to himself as possible, he addressed the mob in order to be heard by all of the few who were fitted to hear him. But the probability is that he persisted in his Zarathustra manner because, while it was obviously false to his aristocratic and exclusive nature, there was something in it that held him and made him indulge it freely before discarding it.

We do not read far in this work without discovering that something is happening which Nietzsche did not clearly foresee. The Zarathustra disguise which deprives us of the Nietzsche we value most, the Nietzsche of the open countenance and the clear penetrating gaze, liberates something that might never have come to the surface. Just as a man will often unbosom himself more completely in the dark than in the full sunlight, or will array himself as a beggar or a reveller only to be more himself, as we put it, than in his work-a-day garb, so Nietzsche in the mask and robes of Zarathustra releases moods and desires which he had not expressed before.

What has happened is that we have lost the Nietzsche we knew and, as the title tells us, we have Zarathustra instead. Zarathustra is the man with a message, who spoke centuries ago in Persia and speaks now in Western Europe. He is not an individual, but a type of mankind, a rare but supremely important type, the prophet. And it is the type that matters here, not the message. We may reject the message of Zarathustra, but we cannot reject Zarathustra himself, the eternal

representative in imaginative literature of those few who go to the mountain-top and descend again to tell what they have seen above the clouds. The spiritual portrait of the prophet-man, as this work gives it, is perhaps the best on record. "The Night-Song," to take a single example, in which the prophet and giver of enlightenment envies the happier lot of them that receive, even as the sun, the fountain of light, might yearn for the shadow which it can never behold, has seldom been equalled in the depth of its spiritual revelation.

"I am light. Alas, would that I were darkness. But this is my solitude, that I am girded with light.

"Would that I were dark and of the dusk. How I would suck at the breasts of light. . . .

But I live in my own light, I drink back into myself the flames that burst forth from me.

I do not know the happiness of him that takes, and often I thought in my dreams that stealing must be more blessed than taking. . . .

Many suns are circling in empty space. They speak with their light to all that is dark. To me they are silent."

And if any final evidence is needed that this, the psychology of the prophet, constitutes the real core of the book, we have the fourth part of *Zarathustra* for proof. Nietzsche completed *Zarathustra*, the *Zarathustra* of his intention, in the three parts which he published. The message is delivered and the work is rounded to a finish. Yet he cannot stop. Freed of his message, he openly indulges his new prepossession. Having revealed his prophetic self lyrically thus far, he now proceeds to dramatize him and to surround him with figures which throw him into action and into relief. Hence the extraordinary encounters of *Zarathustra* in Part IV with the two kings, the magician, the last pope, the ugliest man, the cry of distress. All this adds little or nothing to the philosophical

treatise, but it is the natural and consistent product of Nietzsche's poetic mind at grips with *Zarathustra*.

Thus *Zarathustra* ends by becoming what it began by being in part, a poem with the poet's idealized self-portrait at the heart of it. Imagination for once got the better of intellect. But not for long. Nietzsche regretted the publication of *Zarathustra*; he returned to his lucid and habitual manner never to desert it again, and, even while the work was still on his hands, his rarer intellectual genius revolted against the poet in him and riddled his imaginative darkness with its relentless light.

You, the wooer of truth—they mocked—
No. Only a poet,
A beast, a cunning, creeping beast of prey
That is compelled to lie
To lie deliberately, knowingly,
Greedy for booty.
In gay disguise,
Disguised from itself,
Its own booty.
Is that the wooer of truth?
No, only a fool, only a poet,
Talking jargon.
Shouting luridly through a fool's mask,
Climbing about on deceitful word-bridges
On bright rainbows
Between false heavens
And false earths
Roaming, hovering.
Only a fool, only a poet.

Tolstoy had been thinking similar thoughts not so many years earlier. There is a parallel here, obscured somewhat by the dazzling mastery of Nietzsche's prose, which makes us overlook the partially repressed poet in him, but not less real

on that account. And, of the two, Nietzsche's is the more remarkable case. The passion for truth, the instinct for leadership and prophecy, and the austerity which he shares with Tolstoy—different as the two men are—do not in his case lead him from art and the imaginative life to a moral code and a moral discipline. A naturally blameless and exemplary creature, he had strangely little private need of either; he had no urgent moral problems of his own, nothing in himself to redeem or mortify, no soul that must be saved while there was time, no anguish at the thought of death. Tolstoy's solution would have been utterly gratuitous in his case. Nietzsche had, as it were, all the spiritual attributes of a saint and a martyr without the specific personal problem that usually goes with them and brings them into play. They existed in him and they had to find an outlet. And, failing the usual one, they poured themselves into his philosophical enquiry. Translate into the intellectual life all that we know of unrelaxing, self-unsparing, and extreme in the biographies of holy men, and the spiritual countenance of Friedrich Nietzsche begins to emerge.

This is not to establish any direct antithesis in Nietzsche between morals and intellect. Morals indeed were his single, lifelong study. But it was the investigation of morals, not the enforcement of them; the problem, not the code; the mental approach, not the practice, that occupied him. It is doubtful if the moral life has ever been so thoroughly, so imperiously scrutinized as by Nietzsche in his twenty-odd years of feverish mental activity. The scrutiny begins about 1870 with *The Birth of Tragedy*, which preceded the succession of aphoristic books leading up to *Zarathustra*, and it was still continuing twenty years later in the aphorisms—nearly six hundred in number—which Nietzsche was intending to convert into *The Will to Power*, when his mind was suddenly darkened. The wealth, range, and expressiveness of these writings, aphoristic almost exclusively with here and there a swift essay forged

while the iron was hot, are the despair of critics. They were concerned with morals, it is true, but since morals in their turn concern themselves with nearly everything else, there is little that Nietzsche does not touch, and he touches nothing without illuminating it. But notwithstanding his brilliant excursions into aesthetics, political science, and the history of culture generally, it is the merciless probing of our moral life that gives his works their essential character and their chief value in the modern world.

There is nothing final or organized in these writings. We have attributed to Nietzsche an intellectual quality too subtly truthful, too clear-seeing, too choice, to lend itself to thought-constructions, "the counterfeits of systematic philosophy," the "Falschmünzerei des Systematikers," as he called it. We can see now that there was that in the deeper spirit of the man, in his peculiar tension and bird-like velocity, which forbade system or repose. Sooner might St. Simeon climb down from his pillar or a martyr shrink from his crown of agony than Nietzsche suspend his passionate quest and say to the fleeting moment "Stay, thou art so fair!" Schopenhauer, not the least significant of his early masters, knew his mind almost at once; his impressive four-square tower of metaphysics came almost with adolescence and it contented him to the end. But Nietzsche never knew real finality and it was impossible that he should.

He approaches a summation of his thought in two cases, once in mid-career, in *Zarathustra*, once towards his premature end, in the projected *Will to Power*. But in *Zarathustra* we are confronted finally with two irreconcilable leading ideas, that of the Superman who must clearly be defined as something that has never been before, and that of Eternal Recurrence which announces that everything has been before. Discriminate as we may between logical and poetic symbols there is no squaring these two conceptions satisfactorily, and

Zarathustra, as a philosophical document, must be rated a failure. The *Will to Power* we possess in the sporadic, aphoristic form in which Nietzsche drafted it and in which he would possibly have decided to leave it. Whatever of finality it might have attained had he been able to complete it—he was only in his forties when he wrote it—one cannot surmise to what further surprises his dizzy trajectory might have swept him, had he lived, as as he might have, until to-day.

If Nietzsche desired finality, it was because he had, as *Zarathustra* shows, a prophet's temperament, a prophet's vision of disciples, and a message. He never achieved a prophet's success because his sovereign intellect forbade it. For, if his mind was too scrupulous for poetry, it was also—though this he never clearly recognized—too searching for prophecy. That is why *Zarathustra*, instead of becoming the bible which he intended, comes nearer being a poetic tragedy, the tragedy of the prophet who turns on his disciples and lashes them with his scepticism.

This is the Nietzsche who has made himself most strongly felt in European thought; the restless, experimenting, unbelieving Nietzsche; the destroyer, who rejects everything that has gone before, and throws every man on his own resources. The historians of our epoch will regard the prevailing tendencies in European literature to-day, its impiety, its inquisitive anarchy, its instability, its intellectual aloofness, as essentially Nietzschean. This alone makes him profoundly significant. "I know my fate," he writes in his last lucid months, "my name will be associated with the memory of something tremendous—with a crisis such as the earth has never seen, the deepest clash of conscience and an issue raised against all that has been believed, required, and sanctified. I am not a man, I am dynamite." Extravagant as these words may seem, there is much to justify them. Nietzsche's spiritual force is still unspent; nor would it be surprising if it remained active

for a century or two, much as Rousseau's has. When we observe the extent and accuracy of Nietzsche's anticipation of the intellectual ferment that prevails to-day we need no further evidence to make these extravagant predictions seem plausible.

Yet it is doubtful if Nietzsche, in spite of the central position which he occupies in the riot of to-day, is widely read or is acknowledged as a master by more than a few. The reason is not far to seek. We have examined only one side of his work; the other side shows him to be imbued with the finest traditions and with splendid positive qualities. It may be that many of those who are near him but do not read him would find him too healthy for their taste and even—surprising as it may sound—too much indebted to the past, too conservative. Did he not say “Alles Gute ist Erbschaft”—“Whatever is good in us is inherited”?

To begin with, his innumerable negations are not dictated by the desire for anarchy and destruction, which we seem to see about us to-day. They are based upon principles which he consistently held and which he applied with almost bewildering insight. Using the word in Goethe's sense, rather than Darwin's, he approached the problem of morality *biologically* and asked of every creed and of every ethical attitude “Does it make for the fullness and prolongation of this life or does it impoverish life and destroy it?” His own formulation is better and brings us nearer to him. “My genius is in my nostrils. . . I have a more delicate apprehension (“eine feinere Witterung”) of the signs of health and decay, growth and decadence (“Aufgang und Niedergang”), than any man. I am the teacher of this *par excellence*.” Again the words are extravagant—they come from *Ecce Homo*—and again they are well-nigh unassailable. Nietzsche is, as it were, the great connoisseur in morals, he smells them and tastes them and, like some wine-valuer whose palate can detect the rarest vintages, pronounces upon their dietetic properties. He at-

tacked nothing for the sake of attacking, but always in view of the hidden life-and-death struggle which underlies our moral order. His condemnation of Christian ethics, his contempt for democracy, his distrust of the comfortable materialism and the political philosophy of Germany after 1870 are all applications of this crucial test of vitality and wholesomeness to the life about him. If we read him casually we may see only what is startling and combative and miss the sensitiveness, the almost maidenly delicacy. But it was Nietzsche who wrote in one of his happier, quieter moods: "Let us think no more of punishing, blaming, and improving. We shall seldom change a man; and if we happen to change him, something else may have happened at the same time, without our noticing it: we shall have been changed by him. Let us rather see to it that our influence on what is to come outweighs his. Let us not fight in direct combat. And such is all blaming, punishing, and would-be improving. But let us rather raise ourselves the higher. Let us paint our own example in colours that glow the more. Let us darken the other by our light. No, we will not allow ourselves to become darker on this account, like all who punish and are dissatisfied. Let us rather go aside. Let us look away."

Nietzsche's claim upon us is strengthened by a consideration of his life, origin, and early training. It is natural to expect in so radical, so explosive a writer some discernible reaction against his environment, which thrusts him in a direction not wholly of his choosing. But of this complication we find little or nothing. Nietzsche came of a good, clerical family, against which he never showed any desire to revolt. He accepted the academic life into which his precocious brilliance carried him and he succeeded so well that he was presented with a professorship of classics at Basel at the age of twenty-five before having graduated. Nothing could be better calculated to foster gratitude, contentment, and an

acceptance of things as they are. Even after ill-health had come upon him, his position was curiously fortunate; he was pensioned at thirty-five and was free to follow his mind where it led him.

Thus, his youth and early manhood would seem to have been modified surprisingly little by that undue pressure of circumstance — whether poverty, repression, or discouragement—which so often accounts for the prejudices or the bias of mature life. Here, if anywhere, we have a writer who was given the freedom of his mind, and the leisure in which to express it. That he suffered atrociously from a hypersensitive nervous system which ill-health slowly debilitated must be admitted, but there is every indication that the direction of his mind was established during his student years and that *The Birth of Tragedy* which is the first real clue to his later thought was conceived in reasonable health and prosperity.

There is another aspect of this work which impresses us yet more. Its antecedents are of the richest and finest. Nietzsche in his formative years gave himself with enthusiasm to the noblest cultural traditions of Germany, to Goethe, especially the older Goethe of the Eckermann conversations; to the Greeks, and especially to the Greek tragic dramatists but also to Homer and the early philosophers; to the German idealistic school, and especially to Schopenhauer, who also acquainted him with the best of Oriental mysticism; and to German music of which he was a born appreciator. There is here a convergence, a concentration of spiritual traditions such as had not occurred in German literature since Goethe's *Faust*, and has not occurred again. At the very time when Germany was growing forgetful of her inheritance, here was an assembling of all that made that inheritance truly great. The load was one that a stronger than Nietzsche might have laboured under. Yet his frail shoulders bore it manfully.

His reckoning with it is summed up in his conception of the god, Dionysos, whom we may take as a symbol of all that is truly creative in Nietzsche's spirit; at once his enduring bond with the remote antiquity of Greek religion and the key to his idea of the superman, the higher man whom he bids us look forward to. It implies, above all things, a re-affirmation of life, but it touches depths of dread and heights of exultation which few moralists have ventured to countenance.

It is, on the one hand, a tragic affirmation. We meet it first as an interpretation of tragedy and the tragic undertone persists. But it was more than a danger signal, it was also a summons and an incentive. In one of his latest aphorisms Nietzsche takes issue with Aristotle for interpreting tragedy in terms of emotions that depress. He had written earlier: "There is as much wisdom in pain as in pleasure. It belongs like pleasure to the front rank of those forces which maintain the species. If it were not so, pain would have disappeared long ago. The fact that it hurts is no argument against it. That is its nature. In pain I hear the command of the shipmaster: 'Draw in your sails'. Man, the bold mariner, must be skilled to manage his sails in a thousand ways, else it would too soon be over with him, and the ocean would too quickly draw him down." The joy, the exhilaration with which Nietzsche affirms his acceptance of life, even of all that is darkest in it, is one of the finest tonics in literature. Translation stales it a little and description sours it. It is implicit in the swift ardour of his thought, and in the deft footing of his sentences. It is radiant, and healing, and all that our age will soon be thirsting for. It is perhaps as good an antidote as any to the distemper of to-day. If we cannot dissociate Nietzsche from the malady, we must not be surprised if we find that he is in at the cure.

There are many ways of classifying writers. One of the profoundest, and also one of the most Nietzschean, is that

which divides them into those who lower our vitality and those who raise it. And Nietzsche, if we take him at the full, is secure and eminent among the latter, the masters of "die schenkende Tugend," the bestowers of vitality, the givers of life.

None but a giver of life could have written thus—

"At bottom I hate all those moralities which say "Don't do this. Renounce. Overcome yourself"—on the other hand, I like all those moralities which impel me to do something and to do it again and to dream of it from early till late and all night long and to think of nothing but how to do this thing well, as well as I possibly can. If we live thus, the things that do not belong to such a life continually fall from us, one after the other. Without hatred or resentment we see them take leave of us, this to-day and that to-morrow, like the yellow leaves which every livelier breeze carries from the tree. Or we do not see that they are going, so strenuously is our gaze directed to our goal, directed forward, not sideways, backward, downward. Let what we do determine what we do not do. By doing this, we leave that undone. So I would have it. Such is my pleasure."

THE CARILLON

BY ROWLAND THIRLMERE

This field, remembering a dream
Kindled by starry skies,
Shines with the semblance of its vision!
Earth's very soul, in Paradisean
Ecstasy, soars to the gleam
Of morn in a bird's disguise.

That butterfly has heard the strains
Of thanksgiving: her gay
Bright wings beat time to fluttering lyrics,
The magic of whose panegyrics
Nerved her with strength to cast the chains
Of night and sleep away.

If I housed rapture like this tree
Whose thrush confronts the sun,
Or as that tower, with its amazing
Proud-fretted spire—for ever praising
Beauty—my music might not be
So silent and outdone.

But, in the belfry of my mind
The ringer's hands are still:
A songster, mute in me, refuses
All noonday cheer: though light suffuses
The holly's dusk, it does not find
Hopes in my breast to thrill.

Yet here, in this rich moment, some
Deep influence lends me words
To melt in that carillon, chiming
Below the singers heavenward climbing,
Bidding me echo songs that come
Unbidden to the birds.

SIGHTLESS

You ask me how I knew she was here,
Silent beside you, and no word spoken.
How does a moth discover his mate?
I find my love by a kindred token.

Yes, and I feel the man whom I fear
When glaring at me from behind his fences;
Even as hares the weasel know
I ken vile things by the selfsame senses.

When orchard trees are telling the moon
How joyous she is, I often listen
To words that travel in scent, and I
Hear whispers wherever the field-flowers glisten!

A bat's thin shriek, in the summer dusk,
Is clear to me as my own heart's beating:
I learn in the lisp of the poplar-trees
The love they yield to the soft wind's greeting.

And when folks take me to hills or sea,
Pitying me because of my blindness,
Little they guess of the joy in my blood
Where winds and waves shed a loving kindness.

But O that I knew what it is I feel
Piercing my breast, when I wander lonely
Under the flying sparks of the sky
That burn in the dark of my darkness only!

HIBERNATING BROOD BUTTERFLY

From the black throat of night, piercing my room
The north wind came: without, the dark fields lay
Hushed to endure the wrinkled hand of frost;
The owls were silent and the heavens were lost:
Winter, in sternest mind, had plunged the day
Into a shrouded lake of starless gloom.

Saddened, I marked a sleeping butterfly
On a beam's warmer side, whose folded wings
Screened beauty garnered from the fields of light;
Then, suddenly, upon my secret sight
Broke the lapsed glories of those bygone springs
That fed lost hope with love's divinity.

But while that insect dreamed of April, where
She found the shelter that her spirit chose—
Fulfilled with love and peace in life's decline—
I visioned her brood in spring's warm light ashine
And stole dispirited to my repose,
A shivering, childless thing in Arctic air.

THE SENSITIVENESS OF CANADIANS

BY B. K. SANDWELL

NATIONS are like individuals, in this among other respects, that their true character is obscured from the view of all but Omniscience. There is a Canada as Canadians see her; there is a Canada (or rather there are many Canadas) as Englishmen, Americans and Chinese see her; and there is, presumably, a Canada as God sees her. The last-named vision is truthful and complete. The rest of them are all partial and erroneous, and the first-named, the concept of Canada as it is entertained by the majority of Canadians, is by no means exempt from these defects, and may at times be less exempt from them than some of the others.

Nations are like individuals, also, in that it is important for their growth in mental and moral stature that they should have as accurate an idea of themselves as circumstances allow. Like individuals, therefore, they may profit by a study of the opinions entertained of them by outsiders—by the exercise of the highly desirable power to “see ourselves as others see us.” Reference to the perfectly truthful and complete mirror of the divine vision is unfortunately impossible, or at least (if we assume, as perhaps we may, that the unfoldings of destiny are not unrelated to the judgments of Omniscience, that the mills of God do grind even if they grind very slowly) it takes too long to be of much practical benefit. But reference to the distorted and partial mirrorings of outsiders is not without value as a check upon the distorted and partial mirrorings of our own idea of ourselves. That nation is most wise, which most accurately knows how to revise its opinion of itself, by a properly adjusted allowance for the opinions entertained of it by others. A sane attitude towards external criticism is one

of the best of all signs of national maturity. Complete insensitiveness to this external criticism, such as we may suppose was exhibited by the Sublime Porte régime in Turkey, is a sign of decay, a sort of hardening of the national arteries. Excessive and resentful sensitiveness is equally a weakness, but characteristically a weakness of youth, not unrelated to the well-known phenomena of shyness and bumptiousness in individual adolescence. The mature nation, like the individual in the height of his powers, listens to external criticism with calmness, values it according to its concept of the intelligence and prejudice of the critic, and endeavours to profit by that part of it which appears sound and justifiable.

Canada does not appear to have yet acquired this mature attitude towards the opinions of external critics. Considering the very short time that we have had for acquiring it, this is perhaps not wholly surprising; but since in other respects we rather fancy ourselves as distinctly grown up, it is desirable that we should recognize our juvenility in this respect and make some effort to overcome it. Resentfulness is still our characteristic reaction to frank criticism, expressed by anybody who is not a Canadian, of any phase of Canadian life or Canadian institutions. The reward for such frankness has always been, and still is, the unanimous and acrimonious protest of everything that is vocal in the Dominion. From the *Roughing it in the Bush* of Susanna Moodie to the latest utterances of the Hon. Evan Morgan, the publication of any opinion other than the most ostentatiously flattering has always had the same result. It has elicited a general outcry to the effect that the standards applied to Canada, that the only standards properly applicable to Canada are those selected and applied by ourselves, and that judged by those standards Canada is, and we are, quite all right and beyond criticism.

The classic example of this sort of reaction to criticism, or at any rate to criticism in the field of literature, is the uproar

elicited by Kipling's personification of the Dominion as "Our Lady of the Snows." There is much to be said in favour of that personification. Canada does, after all, resemble Russia considerably more than France or Spain in its geographical characteristics. Snow is an essential element in the climatic factors contributory to our two most important products, timber and hard wheat. It is the basis of many of our native sports, and has much to do with the formation of our national character. In early days it was a powerful aid to transportation, though it is to be feared that modern mobility based on the gasoline engine does not find it so advantageous. So far as I am aware, no high-latitude country has ever shown a disposition to be ashamed of its snow, until Canada early in the present century decided to masquerade before the world as a sub-tropical area, and found Mr. Kipling's poem an obstacle to that ambition.

It is generally supposed that the resentment excited by the Kipling baptism was entirely due to economic considerations—to the fear that it would interfere with immigration. But to put it as baldly as that implies too large a degree of conscious dishonesty in our immigration propaganda. To "sell" a climate which you know to be snowy, by representing it as not being snowy, is deception; to "sell" a climate that is really snowy but which you have hypnotized yourself into believing not snowy is comparatively honest. Canadians at the date in question had really convinced themselves that, judged by the proper standards, the Canadian climate is not a snowy climate; that to get a genuinely snowy climate one must go to Greenland or Northern Norway; and that Kipling, writing for a public largely domiciled in the definitely less snowy countries of Great Britain, the United States, Australia, Africa and India, should nevertheless have used Canadian rather than British or United States standards of snowiness when writing about the Dominion. Something of the same

attitude of mind may be found in the Australians who maintain that Australia is not sparsely populated—according to Australian standards; in the Americans who maintain that murder is not unduly common in the United States—according to American standards; and in the Italians and Torontonians who assert that speech is free in their respective territories—with Italian or Torontonian limitations.

Mr. Kipling's disturbing utterances related merely to our climate, a comparatively unimportant matter, especially in view of the fact that nothing can be done about it. The Hon. Mr. Evan Morgan's opinions related to our social institutions, a more serious thing. He holds that the settlements in our newer territories would be improved by the possession of some sort of community rallying-point for easy social contacts. It is an arguable opinion. Mr. Morgan referred to this rallying-point as a "public-house", and since the public-house implies social drinking, and social drinking for the "lower classes" is distinctly out of favour in Canada for the moment, he was immediately subjected to a great deal of facile and rather vulgar abuse. Yet an Englishman (or rather a Welshman) is permitted to have an opinion about the desirability of public-houses in Canada, and should be permitted to express it without incurring abuse; if it is a good opinion it will do no harm, and if it is a bad one it will ultimately cease to have any influence. True, Mr. Morgan is not an expert upon Canadian social conditions, but it happens that he was discussing the social conditions desirable, in Canada it is true, but for settlements of newly-arrived English immigrants, about whose social needs and capacities he may possibly have special knowledge. We have not of late been so dazzlingly successful in attracting English immigrants that we can afford to be contemptuous of all suggestions for making this country more alluring to them; and one of the respects in which we have most distressingly failed is precisely that of fostering a pleasant

social life in small new communities cut off from easy contact with the larger world. It would be far better to study Mr. Morgan's criticisms with a view to finding out what can be done to meet them, than merely to resent them because they happen to be uttered by an outsider.

It might be supposed that the French-speaking portion of our population, lacking as it does any lively interest in the promotion of immigration, would be perceptibly more philosophical than the rest of us about the opinions expressed concerning Canada by outsiders. So far as these opinions relate only to English-speaking Canada, this philosophical attitude may prevail; but when anybody in Europe, and particularly anybody using the French language, undertakes to voice an independent view, or to draft an independent picture, of French-Canadian life or institutions, the uproar in the journalistic sanctums of Montreal and Quebec is fully as great as it is in Ontario when some Englishman writes about Toronto or Bruce County. We all remember the chorus of repudiation with which *Maria Chapdelaine* was greeted by the French-speaking literary critics in Canada, not for its artistic qualities, which they appreciated very highly, but for what they termed its failure to appreciate the true nature of the French-Canadian people. A similar disapprobation is repeatedly shown for the portrait of the French-Canadian character (not, surely, an unpleasant one, though doubtless pretty heavily romanticized) presented in the poems of the late Dr. Drummond.

The last few weeks have provided another interesting example. It appears that a play has recently been produced in Paris, entitled *Le Collier*, and written by a Parisian dramatist named Henry d'Erlanger, which purports to depict life in the northern wilds of the Province of Quebec. An account of this play reached M. Henri Letondal, dramatic editor of *La Patrie*, a Montreal daily. M. Letondal was shocked. The play, as he describes it, appears to contain a considerable

quantity of snow, a few wolves, and several fur trappers. Its theme is the return to these northern wilds of a young woman, a native of the district, who has been living in a great city, where she succumbed to the ordinary temptations and spent some time in jail; she has just been released, and the judicial authorities have turned her over to the care of the priest of her native parish, who alone knows of her sad story. My readers will be able to supply the rest of the details for themselves. M. Letondal is aggrieved because in this play French-Canadians are depicted as inhabiting "a glacial solitude" ("Our Lady of the Snows" all over again!); because the dialect attributed to them by the playwright is that of Gaspard in *Les Cloches de Corneville*; because the career of the young woman is a slander upon their morals; and finally because one of the Parisian critics told his readers that the scene was laid "dans une contrée de terre américaine." Yet surely it is true that some French-Canadians, like some English-Canadians, do inhabit glacial solitudes, and that such are among the most interesting members of their respective races. Surely it is true that to put a community of North Quebec trappers on the Paris stage speaking no dialect at all—that is to say, speaking the ordinary French of an ordinary modern comedy laid in Paris—would make a misleading impression on the audience; the trappers may for aught I know speak exactly like M. Briand, but it is a convention of the theatre that backwoodsmen do not talk like diplomats, and nobody would believe that they were intended for backwoodsmen unless they were provided with some sort of variant from the ordinary urban speech. Probably the language of Gaspard is as conventional a way of indicating simple rural character among the French as "Waal, I swan" is of indicating the same thing in North America—and just about as near to the language of rural reality. The question of the morals of such a community is too delicate for discussion here; but the last com-

plaint, that French Canada is inaccurately described by a Parisian critic who terms it "*une contrée de terre américaine*", is surely a little hyper-critical. "*Américaine*" has a continental as well as a national meaning (the resultant ambiguity has been often deplored but can hardly be remedied), and the phrase itself surely makes it clear that it is employed in the former sense, as designating the hemisphere rather than the Republic. On the whole, one must conclude that it is going to be very difficult for Parisian dramatists to please Montreal critics with anything that they may write about French Canada.

But the hardest fate of all is that which overtakes the rash outsider (and especially the not quite complete outsider who comes from some other part of the British Empire) who undertakes to make any comment upon the political affairs of the Dominion, and especially upon its acts and status in relation to the other countries of the Empire and of the world. Yet this is a subject upon which we ourselves are urgently in need of all the illumination that can be shed by the frankest possible discussion among ourselves and with our friends. It is surely foolish to deny that the Dominion's external relations are at the moment in a state of extreme fluidity and uncertainty, and call for more rather than less study and criticism by everybody concerned. This being the case, it is absurd to demand that all outsiders shall abstain from discussing these relations, which being external are necessarily of as much interest to at least some of the other peoples of the globe as they are to ourselves. We have a really extraordinary tendency to tell non-Canadians to shut up when they begin to discuss problems, such as those relating to Dominion status, for example, which we are reluctant to discuss ourselves. In 1921, when the changes effected by the War and the Peace Treaties were even less definitely understood and formulated than they are to-day, Mr. Justice Riddell, in reply to some very natural

expressions of curiosity as to what the British Empire had really become, remarked that "the conditions under which the self-governing Dominions were associated with the United Kingdom in an all-British League of Nations were not the business of foreign powers." The *Montreal Star* a few weeks later was echoing his observation in a slightly different form: "It is not the business of any foreign power to assume that the British Empire is not a unit in its foreign relations." These are hard sayings, especially since there would then as now have been a considerable number of Canadians ready to tell these same "foreign powers" that they must equally refrain from assuming the opposite namely that the British Empire *is* a unit in its foreign relations. If foreign powers, and foreign writers, paid any attention to these minatory prohibitions, which are constantly being shouted at them in the name of Canada, they would necessarily conclude that this country is the one part of the earth's surface about which it is unlawful for persons outside of it to entertain any opinions whatever.

This sort of thing may not have been so bad in the time of Susanna Moodie, though even then it was doubtless becoming irksome to the few non-Canadians who had contacts with Canada and felt a yearning desire to be vocal about them. But to-day it is quite another matter. Canada is in several senses one of the most important nations of the world. Her foreign trade is the fifth largest in the world, not per capita but absolutely. Her potential wealth if it could be estimated with any degree of accuracy would probably rank her even higher. Her power of absorption of foreign population is second only to that of the United States—which country is ceasing to be willing to absorb all the population that it could. Her military capacity, not indeed available for instant mobilization but requiring only a short time for preparation, has been demonstrated to be immense. These are not matters

which any outsider, be he merely outside the country or also outside the Empire, can be expected to ignore, or to envisage docilely in whatever light we like to have shed upon them. We really cannot expect that so striking a figure as Jack Canuck has become can henceforth walk the highways of the world's commerce and the world's politics without ever having a finger pointed at him or a word said about his appearance and behaviour. True, we have largely evaded such attentions in the past, but that was merely because our international figure was only dimly visible; in the diplomatic sphere it had none of the ordinary manifestations, and lurked behind the obscuring splendour of the Court of St. James. To-day, however, we stand revealed for all the world to see, with Ministers at the chief capitals and membership in the League of Nations. The world must notice us, and we shall have to get used to being noticed. The process might well have begun earlier. As Professor W. P. M. Kennedy* has recently said, referring to our relations with the United States, they "have been studied as though they were solely and exclusively Anglo-American. In other words, scholars, statesmen, and public writers have tended to lay stress on the European or imperial aspect in them at the expense of the ever-developing point of view of British North America. The Canadian community, with its peculiar social, economic, and political values, while not being neglected, has suffered through being viewed too much from London." Henceforth we have to be viewed as an entity in ourselves. It will involve some censure as well as some praise, some sneers as well as some adulation. We must not be unduly depressed or resentful on account of the one, nor unduly exalted by the other.

Above all it is necessary that we should diminish our sensitiveness to criticism—or to what that sensitiveness interprets

*Introduction to *Canada and the United States*, by Hugh L. Keenleyside; Knopf, New York, 1929.

as criticism—by members or rulers of our fellow-nations within the British Commonwealth, upon matters which fall within the legislative competence of the Dominion of Canada but which have repercussions upon other parts of the Commonwealth. We not infrequently talk as if criticism, or even discussion, of action which we have taken in the unquestioned exercise of our autonomy were the same thing as a denial of our right to take it. It is doubtless true that we have had to put up a long and stern fight for the degree of autonomy which we now possess—though it might be contended that that fight was sometimes rather against elements among our own people who distrusted our fitness for further independence, than against a central government jealously guarding every shred of its power. But that fight is surely over. It is no longer necessary for us to assert our freedom to exclude the goods and even the citizens of other parts of the British Empire to whatever extent we wish, to refrain from contributing to the defence of the Empire except when and as we wish, to amend our own constitution if we wish, to be final judges of our own litigation whenever we wish. These things are conceded; there is no longer any question about them. But it does not follow, because we are entitled to do these things that we are also entitled to go uncriticized for the time or the manner or the spirit or the extent of our doing them. In so far as any autonomous act of ours has its effect upon other parts of the Empire, those parts have a right to have an opinion upon that act, and, if they see fit, to express that opinion to us formally or informally. We do not have to adopt it, but we cannot complain of them for having it.

The fact is, that the exemption which we claim for ourselves goes far beyond what we are ourselves really willing to grant to our sister nations in the Commonwealth. Mr. Meighen has stated the prevalent Canadian view about the obligations of one part of the Empire towards another, in what is in form

a sort of self-denying ordinance for Canada, but in substance is an intimation of what we expect from our sister nations "It is incumbent upon Canadian Governments," he informed the Self-Determination League for Ireland (Canadian) in 1921, "to refrain from any intervention in the domestic affairs of other parts of the Empire." Which means that it is incumbent upon other parts of the Empire to refrain from intervention in ours. The utterance has a specious sound; but the words "intervention" and "domestic affairs" need to be rather carefully defined before it can be taken as a perfect rule for polite procedure between British nations. There are many degrees of intervention. Mr. Meighen was not being asked to send the Canadian Navy to the support of Mr. De Valera. He was merely being asked to address a memorial to the British Government in the name of the people of Canada. Such memorials have, as a matter of historical fact, repeatedly been addressed to British Governments by Canadian Governments on this very subject of the proper way of governing Ireland, and I am not aware that the British Government has ever replied by telling us to mind our own business. If there was a weak point in the position of Canada in these Irish memorials it lay in the fact that the government of Ireland was not only a "domestic affair" of the British Government but a domestic affair in which Canada as such had no specific interest whatever. There are plenty of other "domestic affairs" of the British Government in which we have an interest, and in some of them we have "intervened", in a similar polite and respectful manner, and were perfectly right in so intervening; and conversely there are domestic affairs in Canada in which our sister nations are entitled to take a similar polite and not necessarily silent interest.

The exclusion of Canadian live cattle for alleged quarantine reasons was as much a domestic affair of the British Government as the imposition of a tariff of $27\frac{1}{2}\%$ on British

woollen manufactures is a domestic affair of the Canadian Government. But we spent years protesting against the former, while we should, I fear, have been very much annoyed at any suggestion that any British Government or citizen had a word to say about the latter. The present manipulators of the sale of our export wheat surplus are engaged in a performance which if it were directed against the United States as the importing nation instead of Great Britain would long ago have elicited howls of rage and threats of reprisals—howls and threats which, it may be added, would disturb us hardly at all, because we are used to the United States and understand their language, having had a lot of it directed at us ever since 1814; we are, in fact, practically insensitive to American criticism, which makes it the more surprising that we should resent so vigorously the criticism of all other nations. The British, on the other hand, have hardly said a word about the wheat situation, just as they hardly say a word about our practice of deporting British-born immigrants upon decisions rendered by officials of the Immigration Department, without trial and without appeal; about our flat exclusion of many would-be immigrants of British birth; about our refusal to have British immigration to Canada considered in the light of British unemployment; about our carefully maintained fiction that Canada has no place for immigrants even of British birth unless they are either agriculturists or servant girls. These and many other “domestic affairs” of Canada are highly proper subjects for discussion by British individuals and even by the British Government. Nobody will attempt to “disallow” our legislation about them; but the interests of the Empire may from time to time make it inevitable that we should be asked whether we cannot modify some of that legislation without serious harm to ourselves, and be informed as to the effects which it produces in other parts of the world. At present, responsible British public men will do anything rather than utter the

humblest comments upon these matters, because they know the extreme irritability of Canadian opinion. (I do not suggest that it is confined to Canada; the same phenomenon may be found in South Africa, in Australia, in many other parts of the Empire, and notably in Kenya Colony.) But this "hush, hush" attitude cannot be maintained indefinitely; "don't wake the baby" is not possible as a permanent and all-day rule in any household. It has already interfered gravely with many constructive proposals for the closer co-operation of the component parts of the Empire; it will interfere still more seriously in the future if Great Britain should, as seems possible, lessen somewhat her reliance upon laissez-faire in the economic sphere.

PENTECOST IN LEGEND AND HISTORY

BY N. MICKLEM

AT Whitsun or Pentecost the Church celebrates her own birthday as at Christmas she celebrates the birth of Christ. The twenty-fifth of December, the *dies natalis solis invicti*, when the pagans were rejoicing that once again the invincible sun was beginning to triumph over the winter darkness, was an excellent occasion for the Christians, in the absence of any reliable tradition of their own, to celebrate the coming of their brighter Sun, their "Dayspring", as they sometimes called him, their "bright and morning star." Pentecost was the occasion on which the Jews were wont to celebrate the giving of the Law to Moses on Mount Sinai, when, as one of their rabbinic legends declared, the voice of God proclaiming the Law had divided itself into seventy languages that all the nations of the earth might hear.¹ Judaism was the religion of the Law, Christianity of the Spirit. What better season, then, than Pentecost could the Christians select upon which to celebrate the coming of that holy Spirit which created the Church and sent it forth upon its world-embracing mission?

What, we ask, is the historical value of the Pentecost narrative in Acts (II, 1-13); and, inasmuch as great events must have adequate causes, does the narrative explain or logically involve the great movement which is alleged to have arisen from it?

¹This Jewish festival is not certainly attested till the end of the second century. It is not likely to have been celebrated, till the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D. had made it impossible for the Jews to keep the Feast of Weeks. Similarly we do not know when Pentecost as the festival of the Spirit was adopted into the Christian calendar; it was probably the Christian answer to the new Jewish rite; in any case it is clear that the Christian narrative of Pentecost in Acts is coloured by the Jewish legends of the Law-giving.

First it will be well to analyse the story by itself, then to consider any other narratives or hints in the New Testament which tend to corroborate or contradict it, and next to review in brief that distinctive Christian experience which was called the receiving of the holy Spirit. Such a study should have a practical as well as an archaeological interest; it should provide us with a norm whereby to decide whether a similar experience has reappeared constantly or from time to time in Christian history, and it might indicate some principle or idea which would throw light upon that revival of genuine and passionate religion which is the supreme and recognized need of our own generation.

I

In Acts II, 7-13, then, we read that at Pentecost "they" or "they all" (the text is uncertain) were met together in a house; either the twelve apostles including the newly elected Matthias or the whole company of disciples must be meant. There was suddenly heard from the sky a noise "like a violent blast of wind", as Moffatt happily translates it, and "it filled the whole house." This audition was followed by a vision which unfortunately is not recorded in intelligible terms. It is usual to picture the disciples each one with a tongue of fire resting and flickering upon his head. This is possibly what the writer intended, but the Greek says obscurely, "there appeared to them forking tongues (or tongues distributing themselves) as if they were of fire, and it sat upon each one of them, and they were filled with the holy Spirit."² They saw divided or forking tongues which looked like fire but were not fire, and something sat or rested upon them. That the tongues or the fire rested upon them is excluded by the grammar. They heard, then, a noise that filled the house; they saw bright fiery tongue-shaped objects; something rested on them; they were

²Ophthesan autois diamerizomenai glossai hosei puros, kai ekathisen eph' hena hekaston auton. The *ardua lectio* ekathisen, not ekathisan, is almost certainly to be preferred.

all filled with the holy Spirit and began to speak "with other tongues", as the Spirit gave them utterance.

Many will surmise that there are legendary elements in this narrative; but it is perhaps not quite necessary to suppose this, for auditions are not uncommon in cases of religious excitement, and during the last great religious revival in Wales it was alleged that mysterious lights or fiery balls were seen hovering in the air. What is meant by the filling with the holy Spirit and the speaking "with other tongues" the sequel is intended to explain; for we are told that there were pious Jews from all over the world settled or staying in Jerusalem, and that, when "this voice" was heard (that is, presumably, either the noise from the sky or the noise of the disciples' "other tongues"), "the crowd" came together and was confounded because each man heard in his own language the speech of the disciples. Some were greatly impressed, others supposed that the disciples were intoxicated.

Here we meet two further perplexities. First, are we to suppose that the "crowd" that collects at the sound of the noise happens to consist of the pious Jews from all over the world? Second, if all the audience heard the speech of the apostles each in his own language, they might well recognize a miracle, but they would hardly suppose the disciples to be drunk. Moreover, the miracle, if it was such, was somewhat unnecessary, for all those who lived or stayed in Jerusalem would understand either Aramaic or Greek, and most would understand both. Again, the disciples were apparently indoors, and, as the sequel shows, they were not making public speeches; how, then, did the audience, who were gathered by "the voice", catch what the disciples were saying? If, on the other hand, the disciples were "speaking with tongues", that wild, incoherent, unintelligible speech technically called glossolalia, of which we read in 1 Corinthians XIV, 1 ff. and elsewhere, they might have appeared drunken, but they were not speaking in foreign

languages.³ Finally, neither speaking "with tongues" nor a miraculous knowledge of foreign languages is adequate as an account of that experience which created the Christian Church.

There is, then, within the narrative itself a number of obscurities and inconsistencies, (*a*) the verb "it rested" or "it sat" without a subject; (*b*) the reference in the second part of the story to "the voice", though strictly no voice has been mentioned; (*c*) the confusion between the "pious Jews" from all over the world and the "crowd"; (*d*) the two quite different interpretations of the "other tongues", one as foreign languages, the other as glossolalia. To these may be added (*e*) the ill-defined and unconvincing nature of the audition and vision.⁴ The most probable elucidation of these difficulties lies through the recognition that we are dealing here with a composite cult-legend which in its inconsistencies and obscurities reflects the heterogeneous elements out of which it has been constructed. The best argument for this view will be its elucidation in detail.

A cult-legend is an explanatory tale told at a festival or rite. Thus the narratives of the birth of Jesus, of the institution of the Supper, of the Resurrection are cult-legends suitable for the celebration of Christmas, of the Eucharist, of Easter or the Lord's Day. The term "legend" in this connection does not imply that the narratives are without historical worth. In the present instance we have the cult-legend of Whitsun in the developed and relatively late form in which

³Glossolalia is well attested from many ages and centuries, see Émile Lombard, *de la glossolalie chez les premiers chrétiens et des phénomènes similaires*, and Eddison Mosiman, *das Zungenreden geschichtlich und psychologisch untersucht*, and also Carl Clemen, *religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des neuen Testaments*, p. 157f.

⁴I am not anxious to maintain that the obscurities and inconsistencies cannot be removed by a free exercise of the imagination and the subtleties of harmonizing exegesis; thus, for instance, the word translated "voice" might possibly mean only "sound", and if the disciples spoke "with tongues", those present might understand (not hear) each in his own language. See K. L. Schmidt, *Pfingsterzählung und Pfingstereignis*; but there is at least a *prima facie* case for a conflation of sources.

it was known to the writer of Acts. How and in what locality the legend assumed its present form we cannot say, but it seems possible for us with some assurance to analyse it into its component parts; these derive, as we might antecedently expect, partly from historical reminiscence and partly from primitive Jewish-Christian preaching.

Three elements are to be clearly distinguished: (1) an historic narrative, the tradition of the first appearance of "speaking with tongues" among the Christians. We need not doubt that this gift was manifest in Jerusalem in the Church of the very earliest days; quite possibly it appeared at the first Pentecost after the Crucifixion. By some the inspired Christians would be regarded as drunken; others would be convinced that the long promised Spirit had at last been poured forth from on high. It should be borne in mind that this ecstatic gift, which makes so small an impression upon us with our wider grasp of religious history and of psychology, must in those early days have seemed to many to provide sure proof and supernatural authentication of the Christian testimony, (2) a Jewish Christian midrash or edifying story designed to draw out the significance of the coming of the Spirit. The Jews supposed that beneath the plain and primary meaning of the historical narratives of Scripture lay hid a deeper, spiritual meaning; this must be "sought for" (*darash*) and set forth in a concrete narrative, a *midrash*. Thus, on one historical occasion the Lord gave his people to drink from the rock that Moses struck. But it was realized that in a deeper sense not once but always through their wanderings God gave them to drink as he fed them with the heavenly manna. This might be expressed in the seemingly historical form that the rock followed Israel for forty years; "now that rock," adds Paul, "was Christ." Neither Paul nor the rabbis whose exegesis he is following intended this embroidery of Scripture to be taken literally, and no Jew or Jewish Christian would

misunderstand the symbolism nor mistake it for history. In the present instance we have a Christian midrash parallel to, and suggested by, the Jewish midrash of the giving of the Law on Sinai through the voice that spoke to the seventy nations. One form of that cycle of Jewish legends, closely akin to parts of the story in Acts, is to be found in Chapters IX and XI of Philo's treatise "on the Decalogue", published, it is likely, some years before Acts was composed. The historical event is the coming of the Spirit; but that coming of the Spirit is much more than a mere isolated event; it marks a new epoch in religion, or the birth of a new religion, based on a "new covenant." This deeper significance is expressed in a midrash in terms of the legends of the giving of the "old covenant" amid thunder and fire through a divine voice speaking to the nations. The sound like a wind or spirit from heaven, the fiery apparitions⁵ and the miraculous speech understood by all the nations come from this source. The conception is almost exactly expressed by Keble in his familiar lines:

The fires, that rushed on Sinai down
In sudden torrents dread,
Now gently light, a glorious crown,
On every sainted head.

And, as on Israel's awe-struck ear,
The voice exceeding loud,
The trump, that angels quake to hear,
Thrilled from the deep dark cloud;

So, when the Spirit of our God
Came down, his flock to find,
A voice from heaven was heard abroad,
A rushing mighty wind.

It would be difficult to improve upon this symbolic method of setting forth the facts, and no Jewish Christian, it is to be surmised, would ever mistake midrash for historical narrative.

⁵The fact that the Hebrew *lashon* (though not, it seems, the Syriac *leshna*) means a tongue of flame as well as speech may have added to, or aided, the confusion.

(3) Also a narrative of the coming of the Spirit viewed as an inward experience. The voice from heaven or *bath qôl* (the "daughter of the voice of God") is the regular concrete form, a particular variety of midrash, used for the setting forth and interpretation of religious experience. It is the medium, for instance, whereby the experience of Jesus at his baptism, the significance of his journey to Jerusalem (in the Transfiguration story), and the conversion of the Apostle Paul as narrated in Acts are set forth. Here similarly the Christian experience is proposed as a *baptism* of the holy Spirit. John indeed had baptized with water, but the chief significance of Christian baptism was that it marked the adoption of the baptized as a child of God and the outpouring of the holy Spirit upon him. As in the baptism of Jesus a voice speaks from heaven and the Spirit as a dove descends upon him, so here there is a "voice" from the sky and the descent of *something* (the Spirit?, a dove?) upon the assembled disciples. No Jewish Christian would misunderstand such a story; none would mistake the poetry for prose; it would at once be seen that an inward religious experience was being described in the customary and only available terms in which such mysteries can be set forth. The baptism *motif* further explains why the "fire" is associated with the "tongues" which themselves symbolize the gift of the Spirit. "Matthew" and "Luke", when they came to tell of the baptism of John, had before them a common source, usually styled "Q", which, as may reasonably be surmised, represented John as saying: "I baptize you with water, but there cometh after me he that is mightier than I; he shall baptize you with fire"; in the context the fire must be that of judgment (Matt. III, 12; Luke III, 17). The first and third evangelists had also before them the Roman Gospel of Mark, who with an eye to the Christian sacrament of baptism and the fundamental difference between Judaism and Christianity had written: "he shall baptize you with the holy

Spirit.” In the first and third Gospels these two traditions are conflated and combined into the incongruous: “he shall baptize you with the holy Spirit and fire.” It is presumably this conflated reading which closely associates fire with the holy Spirit in the narrative of Acts—a further indication of the secondary nature of our source.

If the foregoing analysis be approved, we have three modes of telling the story combined in one narrative; first, the historical event itself, the coming of the Spirit, told in the historic form of the gift of “tongues”; second, the same event viewed in its wider significance as a new start in religion comparable to the Law-giving on Sinai; third, the same event regarded as an inward experience of the soul, a baptism from on high, a resting of the new Spirit upon those present. We might conclude that the earliest Church cherished a far profounder interpretation of the coming of the Spirit than the rather confused miracles of the present text would suggest.

II

We may next consider whether there are any further references to Pentecost in the New Testament such as will corroborate or deny the account hitherto considered.

(a) In the opinion of some scholars there is a double tradition within the book of Acts itself. Thus Harnack maintains that chapters II and III contain parallel traditions which may be called A and B:—

A. (1) Peter and John on their way up to the Temple heal the lame man (III, 1-1); this is told as the original, decisive miracle which determines the sequel.

(2) Peter’s sermon based on this miracle (III, 11-26).

(3) The amazing result, five thousand are added to the Church (IV, 4). Harnack further suggests that for “five thousand”, which must certainly be an exaggeration, we should

read "five hundred", the five hundred brethren who, as Paul tells us, "saw the Lord" (I Cor. XV, 6).

(4) This is followed (in IV, 31) by an account of the descent of the holy Spirit: "and as they prayed, the place where they were gathered was shaken, and they were all filled with the holy Spirit, and spoke the word of God with freedom." By "the word of God" is doubtless meant the Christian message; thus the preaching of the Gospel, not speaking with tongues, is said to be the result of the Spirit's coming.

The B tradition differs in many particulars:

(1) The miraculous outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost and the speaking "with other tongues" (II, 1-13).

(2) Peter's speech based upon this miracle (II, 14-36).

(3) The amazing result, three thousand are added to the Church (II, 37-47).

Both these traditions, then, narrate a miracle, a sermon by Peter based upon it, and the ingathering of a large number of converts, and both are intimately connected with the coming of the Spirit. Of the two Harnack would regard B as altogether secondary.

We may note that the A tradition, if combined with the evidence of Paul, our sole contemporary authority (I Cor. XV, 1-9), gives us a straight-forward and intelligible account of the beginnings of the Christian movement. We should infer that at an unknown interval after the Crucifixion the Lord appeared to the broken and penitent Peter, almost certainly in Galilee. At a somewhat later date he appeared also to the Twelve, whom doubtless Peter had gathered together once again. The recreated band of disciples return to Jerusalem, where Peter and John heal the lame man "in the name of Jesus of Nazareth." The effect of the miracle upon the disciples is to make them realize the presence and power of the risen Jesus. Peter makes a speech which results in the conversion of some

five hundred brothers upon whom the Spirit is poured forth; they see the Lord and at once set forth to proclaim the new Gospel. There is no reference here to the gift of "tongues" and none to Pentecost as the date, but there is a true spiritual sequence, and the cause is adequate to the effect. The A tradition of Acts, then, is intelligible and spiritually consistent; it is virtually irreconcilable with the B narrative of Acts II, 1-13, if we take that *au pied de la lettre*. But it is possible to bring the two into relation if we assume that Peter and the disciples first returned to Jerusalem for the Feast of Weeks, and that the gift of "tongues" appeared in the earliest days.

(b) The book of Acts was composed some fifty to eighty years after the beginning of the Christian Church. The apostle Paul is our primary authority for the apostolic age. To him Christianity was first and foremost the religion of the Spirit; his theology, his doctrine of the Christian life, his counsel in matters of public worship are determined by his conception of the Spirit; he was familiar with Peter and James; he knew and handed on to his converts the tradition of the Church, and he himself, as he tells us (I Cor. XIV, 18) had the gift of tongues. Yet he never refers to Pentecost as marking the date of the coming of the Spirit, gives no hint of the miraculous occurrences narrated in Acts II, 1-13, and regards "love" not "tongues", as the pre-eminent gift of the Spirit. True, Paul's great doctrine of the Spirit as making supernatural the whole life of the believer is Hellenistic in form, and Acts rightly represents the primitive Jewish-Christian conception of the Spirit as an irruptive force intermittently coming upon men and endowing them for the time with supernatural power;⁶ but Paul's disparagement of "tongues" and his representation of the earliest Christian *kerygma* or Gospel as centering exclusively around the Passion and Resurrection would have been hardly possible if the Pentecost story in Acts taken literally

⁶See E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament*.

had been part of the earliest Christian witness.⁷ Not Pentecost but Easter, in Paul's view, marked the birth of the Christian Church.

But, if the Pentecost narrative in Acts taken literally was, as we must conclude, unknown to Paul, yet the conceptions which, if our analysis is accurate, underlie the legend in Acts, and which the editor of Acts has prosaically conflated into a series of miracles, are wholly along the lines of Paul's thought and language. He always asserted that "tongues" was one of the Spirit's gifts; he loved to compare and contrast the religion of the Spirit with the religion of Sinai, and he maintained, none more clearly, that the gift of the Spirit was first and foremost an inward experience.⁸

(c) The authorship and date of the Fourth Gospel are problems still much in dispute, but it is generally agreed that the book appeared in the Roman province of Asia in the first quarter of the second century (or a little earlier) and that it was sponsored in some degree by a venerated Christian leader who had known some of the apostolic band, if he had not himself been a member of the earliest Church in Jerusalem. If the author of this Gospel was unaware of the Pentecost narrative in Acts, that story can have formed no part of the original Christian preaching; but, if he was aware of it, he either knew it in some form such that its poetical or spiritual character was clear, or he goes out of his way to contradict or, at least, reinterpret it, when he tells that the risen Lord "breathed upon" his disciples and said unto them, "Receive

⁷Significant testimony to the same effect is to be drawn from Clement of Rome, whose epistle possibly, or probably, antedates Acts., c.f. I Clem. II and XXXV f. It is noteworthy that in the index of Scripture references at the end of Dr. Wheeler Robinson's *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit* there is no reference to Acts II, 1-13, nor to any verse of it; there is, however, on p. 133, a passing reference to "a remarkable physical and psychical experience" at Pentecost.

⁸Paul does not directly speak of the receiving of the Spirit as a baptism, but the idea is implied, c.f. I Cor. XII, 13; Gal. III, 27; Rom. VI, 4; Col. II, 12.

ye the holy Spirit" (XX, 22). To the Pentecost narrative there is no direct reference whatever. But the modes of exegesis which lie behind the story in Acts, as we have analysed it, can be sufficiently illustrated from the Fourth Gospel itself, for the *midrash* or edifying story based on history and the voice from heaven (XIII, 28, cf. I, 33) are pre-eminently the means used by the author for his inspired preaching. His account of the baptism of Jesus is here particularly instructive (I, 29-34). That the words put into the Baptist's mouth are midrashic rather than historical few scholars would now deny; and, further, the word of God to the Baptist that he upon whom the spirit should descend and abide was he who should himself baptize with the holy Spirit is closely parallel to the broken hint in Acts that when in fact the disciples were baptized with the Spirit, a voice was heard from heaven and the Spirit rested upon each of them.

This part of our discussion may be concluded by a consideration of a general kind. The books of the New Testament were written for the service of the Christian Church, and often both reflect and subtend the Christian cultus or calendar. Thus Mark's Gospel, as Bacon has indicated, moves round the two poles of baptism and the Supper. Again, the Fourth Gospel is almost certainly accurate when it represents the Crucifixion of Jesus as having taken place on the day before the Passover; but it was natural that when the Jews celebrated their Passover, the Christians should celebrate their greater festival of redemption; Mark accordingly represents the Last Supper, in spite of all historic probability and the implications of his own narrative, as being itself the Passover meal.⁹ Similarly, the date of the Resurrection according to our earliest evidence (I Cor. XV, 4);

⁹Mark writes for the Roman Church and reflects Western ecclesiastical usage. His chronological scheme for the last days is a piece of subtle propaganda against the Asian and apostolic tradition as to the date of Easter. See Bacon, *The Gospel of Mark*, p. 168.

was deduced from Scripture, not derived from experience, and for long it was customary in the Asian Churches to celebrate the death and Resurrection of Jesus on the fourteenth of Nisan, whatever day of the week that might happen to be, in pursuance of the primitive tradition that he rose on the evening after the Crucifixion; the precisely dated Resurrection narratives of the Synoptists clearly reflect the cult requirements of the Western, post-apostolic Church. Finally, it is not to be disputed that the choice of December 25 for the celebration of Christ's Nativity was not in any way determined by historical tradition. There is nothing unique or surprising, therefore, in our contention that the narrative of Acts II, 1-13 is a cult-legend, which probably presupposes, but does not account for, the Christian celebration of Pentecost as the festival of the Spirit. Pentecost may have been chosen because of the Jewish celebration of the Law-giving at that season, or because Peter and the reconstituted band of disciples actually first returned to Jerusalem at this time, or because the date marked the first appearance of the gift of "tongues."

It is impossible to give dates for the coming of the Spirit, partly because the coming of the Spirit is not to be separated from the coming back of Christ, and here we can only say, "he appeared first to Cephas"; partly because the holy Spirit had ever been operative moving the prophets and holy men of old. It is fitting that on one particular day the Church should celebrate the coming of the Spirit; but the idea that on one particular day the holy Spirit, hitherto withheld from mankind, was poured forth simultaneously upon every member of the Church belongs to legend, not to history. The gift of "tongues" was only one manifestation, and that neither very important nor permanent, of the remarkable and indeed altogether miraculous religious revival which carried Christianity on its victorious course from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth.

III

What then was that new life, the new exaltation of spirit, which came into the world with Christianity and of which speaking with "tongues" was an illustration or symptom? No systematic analysis can be here attempted, but clearly the following elements entered into the experience and were far more fundamentally constitutive of the new life than was the more spectacular and transient gift of "tongues."

(1) The New Testament reflects everywhere a vivid and overwhelming sense of relief, of liberty, of sheer happiness. The early Christians issuing from the lowering shadows of Sinai or the oppressive fatalism of the pagan world were in that aspect like a crowd of school children shouting and jostling one another as they stream out into the sunshine. "When I knew that there is a God," said the 'Rabbi' Duncan, "I danced upon the brig o' Dee with delight." That was the spirit of the early Church.

(2) The gift of "tongues" was chiefly significant not for itself but as an indication, sensible and not to be controverted, that the spirit prophesied by Joel as a mark of the Messianic age had actually been poured forth (Acts II, 16 ff.); the "powers of the age to come" were already impinging upon this age; in principle Satan had already been vanquished, and his kingdom was tottering to its fall. This had been the good news which Jesus himself had taught alike by his miracles of healing, his parables of the Kingdom, and in the Beelzebub controversy; now it was further vindicated by Peter and John in the lame man's miraculous cure.

(3) The "powers of the age to come" involved the inspiration required to fulfil an ethic beyond the reach of the world at large. A new ethical enthusiasm and attainment, therefore, are characteristic marks of early Christianity and of the new Christian spirit. It is true that primitive Jewish Christianity had no desire to break away from Judaism and

no quarrel with the Jewish Law, that the Church as a whole never understood Paul's doctrine of the freedom of the spirit, and that the Church, fortified by the first and third Gospels, fell back upon a neo-legalism which was not derived from Jesus; but even "Matthew" indicates the new ethical impulse in his demand that the righteousness of Christians must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, and it has been reserved for modern commentators to explain that the Sermon on the Mount, however admirable as an ideal, enunciates principles which in the present imperfections of national and international life cannot be put into effect. The ethical demands of Jesus, as Albert Schweitzer pleads in word and yet more eloquently by his life, are unconditioned.

(4) Again, the Spirit is the spirit of adoption, of sonship. The phrase may be Paul's, but the idea is common to the whole Church. "God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts whereby we cry 'Abba'," the name which Jesus had used and which came to Gentile Christianity through the Jerusalem Church. The beautiful *midrash*, or poetic narrative, in which the significance of Jesus' baptism is set before us in the Gospels, is dominated by the Christian experience of baptism as an adoption into sonship and a reception of the holy Spirit.

(5) Lastly, though the Church came to celebrate the Resurrection at Easter and the Spirit at Whitsun, yet in religious experience the Resurrection of Jesus and the coming of the Spirit are indissolubly united. Peter may first have spoken with a tongue at Pentecost, but he assuredly received the Spirit when the Lord appeared to him, and he being "converted" began to "stablish his brethren."¹⁰ Paul elaborates but does not invent the intimate connection and indeed identity between that coming again of Jesus which was the

¹⁰No problem in connection with the Resurrection is more baffling than that which concerns the absence from the first three Gospels of the appearance of the Lord first to Peter.

Resurrection and that coming again which was the Spirit. Whatever vision of Christ the disciples and Paul may have received did but reflect their realization that "the gates of Hades" had not prevailed against him, and that he was still present in their midst to strengthen and inspire.

Even this brief survey of the experience of the primitive and still Jewish-Christian Church may suffice to provide a norm whereby to test whether or no the great movements which from time to time have stirred in Christianity have been properly "revivals", renewed outpourings of the holy Spirit. Amongst the tokens we should expect to find in a revival that was truly "Pentecostal" would be, first, a sense of relief and of abandon; second, a high victorious conviction that the powers of hell are being overthrown; third, closely associated with this, a new ethical enthusiasm and power; fourth, a realization of sonship; and fifth, a conviction of "the real presence" of Jesus Christ.

Much as we may admire, for instance, the devotion and idealism of the monastic movement, it will be difficult to see in it a revival of that type of Christianity which as Biblical is regarded as normative. The Franciscan movement, on the other hand, at least in its earlier days and as it remained true to the spirit of Francis himself, was in many aspects truly "Pentecostal." Thus in Francis, who declared that in his Lady Poverty he had found a wife "more beautiful, more pure, more true than ever you could imagine", in his precursors who were styled *joculatores Dei*, God's merry jesters, we find a real sense of liberation and abandon; while in the uprising of the Tertiary Order, in Francis' own missionary endeavours, in his utter repudiation of the standards and values of the world we find something redolent of the spring-time of Christianity, of "the love of thine espousals." In spite of its many limitations intellectual and spiritual the Franciscan movement marks a re-discovery of Jesus, another coming of the Spirit.

Much the same might be said of the movements led by Martin Luther and George Fox especially in the persons of these two men.

Similarly, England in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries experienced two great religious uprisings, the "Evangelical Revival" and the "Oxford Movement." We are not required to contrast the two outstanding leaders, John Wesley and John Henry Newman, in respect of their integrity, the purity of their motives, their devotion to the will of God, their personal piety and Christian character; but judged by the tests we have enunciated it is plain that the Evangelical Revival was "Pentecostal" in a sense in which the Oxford Movement neither was nor claimed to be. This becomes sufficiently plain, if, for instance, we contrast the *Lyra Apostolica* or even *The Christian Year* with the hymnody of the Wesleys.

IV

The study of history is of mere archaeological interest except in so far as it throws light upon the present. There is no need of the modern world so profound and comprehensive as that of a quickening of real religion. But Christians tend to think of a revival of religion in terms of a re-enacting of "Pentecost" as described in Acts; very naturally, too, the Church, discouraged and hard bested, visualizes, as the marks and fruits of revival, crowds flocking to its public services, money poured into its treasuries, enthusiastic attendance at its meetings, and the triumph of its political ideals, as if a revival of religion must inevitably bring with it the enlargement and prosperity of existing ecclesiastical institutions. But a revival presupposes a prophet. Peter and Francis, Luther, George Fox and Wesley were repudiated by the Churches from which they sprang; it has yet to be seen whether any existing Church in Christendom could contain the heavenly vintage if it were poured into the time-worn bottles, and it is

to be regarded as a serious possibility that the next revival of religion may arise, much to its disadvantage, outside the boundaries of organized Christianity.

How, why and whence a religious revival comes we cannot tell, but with our eyes upon the New Testament it is not arbitrary for us to make certain predictions as to what a renewal of Christianity, an "outpouring of the Spirit" would mean in our day. Such an objective analysis is not to be confounded with a prediction; none the less the cause of vital religion is notably furthered wherever the intrinsic nature of Christianity is clearly grasped. This analysis, with which we close, is virtually a retranslation into modern speech of those tokens of the Spirit which were set forth above in the terminology and under the thought-forms of the primitive Jewish-Christian community.

That same mood of hope and daring, of liberation from self and from what Burke called "the masquerades of the grand carnival of our age", that sense of fellowship in a cause more precious than life, which came to many when in a moment of idealism they offered themselves for military service, and which is enshrined in the war-poetry of Rupert Brooke, would return in a more permanent and satisfying form with a real revival of Christianity. Men would no longer regard themselves as being in the grip of a relentless destiny, the victims of heredity, the puppets of environment. But such an experience would be impossible without an inward harmonization or integration of personality and without a triumphant conviction that all the powers of the Universe are on the side of right and truth; this experience, then, however its expression might diverge from the language of orthodoxy, would be both evangelical and apocalyptic.

This, again, would inevitably involve a rediscovery of sonship; but sonship in the proper Christian sense has little to do with the modern widely-held "belief" in the Fatherhood of

God and the Brotherhood of man, the cant phrase of a world divided into mutually suspicious nations and classes, and aware chiefly of *la grande absence de Dieu*. Sonship means reconciliation and forgiveness, a communion of the soul with the living God.

From this would follow a new ethical insight and mission, a conviction that the principles of the Kingdom of God as proclaimed by Jesus are obligatory upon Christians living in a sub-Christian world. The recent attempts made by Christian theologians to justify war in the name of Jesus have neither satisfied the minds of those for whose comfort they were written nor impressed those outside who judge Christianity by its Founder; they afford a sufficient indication that the triumphant spirit of the early days has fled. A revived Christianity is normally both feared and persecuted.¹¹

Finally, a revival of Christianity in its pristine strength is not to be anticipated apart from a resurgence of faith in the risen Christ. Modern critical scholarship may, perhaps, prepare the way for this by showing that, to judge by our earliest evidence, that of the apostle Paul, the resurrection of Jesus was in the first days of Christianity a matter primarily of spiritual experience, not of physical miracle. It is likely that, in proportion as this is stressed, the Resurrection will be intimately associated in idea with the "communion of saints." It is to be supposed that a revival of Christianity would lead men afresh to realize the spiritual presence of an "innumerable company of witnesses" as of him to whose grace and power they bear their testimony. It will be triumphantly proclaimed that it is not given to death to snap the bonds of fellowship between the children of God, and that the Church in heaven and on earth is one.

¹¹If the Christians of all denominations and none could find themselves persecuted in some good cause, the problem of Christian unity would be more furthered than by endless conferences and memoranda.

Whether Christianity as a religion bears within it the power and truth for a revival of religion in the modern world is a question beyond the scope of this paper; but the world of our time seems to be groaning and travailing in pain, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God, and the first prayer of the Church is also the last, *marana tha*.

THE DIARY OF FRANCIS DICKENS

BY VERNON LACHANCE

THE winter at Fort Pitt had been unusually fine; 1884 had turned into 1885 with hardly a break in the succession of delightfully clear days. It was March and the few permanent residents, with irrepressible optimism, were already speaking hopefully of the prospects for an early spring. Travel along the North Saskatchewan river was brisk, and each day brought its quota of itinerants: government officials, Hudson's Bay Company and independent traders, missionaries, freighters, and trappers—red, white, and mixed. The tiny settlement's name was more imposing than its tactical situation. Not even the palisades and bastions of the Hudson's Bay Company post or the barracks of the North West Mounted Police could offset the weakness of its location one hundred yards back from the river on a flat dominated by an eminence. But the Saskatchewan—river of shifting channel and sandbars—was deep and rapid here, and fully three hundred yards wide, an advantage too great to be ignored.

Built by the Hudson's Bay Company in 1831, Fort Pitt admirably served its purpose as an intermediate point between Edmonton, 200 miles to the west, and Fort Carlton, almost as far in an opposite direction. It had never been a Company post in the ordinary sense of the word; only pemmican from the adjacent prairies and a few beaver brought in by the Woods Crees were its harvest. It was important as a port of call, a stopping place in winter and in summer. Even in summer, when the mighty brigades of the traders gave colour to the great river, visitors from the East eagerly looked forward to their first glimpse of Fort Pitt as the dividing line between prairie and northern forest. They were amply repaid in their expectations. Sweeping around a curve in the

river one met a scene of beauty; the broad waters lapping the flat on the north bank carried the eye beyond to the gradually rising land clothed with thick aspen and poplar bush, intermingled with the rich green of the spruce that signalled the end of monotonous prairie; the south shore, with its regular rising terraces, was almost parklike at first glance—a scene of peaceful charm.

If Fort Pitt failed to justify its name in appearance it likewise gave no indication of its stormy history. The swift-flowing stream at its feet, the dark forests behind failed to suggest the blood-spattered story which had been enacted within their compass. Nor was the significance of some of the names of the district's landmarks—Battle River, Four Blackfoot Hills, Neutral Hills—fully appreciated, except by a few. Occasionally an older resident or one of the passing traders of a previous generation would grow reminiscent. He might tell of the days when the brigades of the traders and the canoes of the solitary trappers stole silently and furtively to the protection of the Company's walls. He might speak of the events and traditions of the warfare between those deadly and hereditary enemies—the Crees and the Blackfeet. The story would be an unveiling of the character of the two strongest and most opposed savage tribes in the Northwest.

Fort Pitt was "No Man's Land" in those days. Such it was to the Crees when the lordly Blackfeet, who recognized no limitations, made sportive raids into their midst. The Blackfeet roamed at will from the far south country of the Missouri to north of the Saskatchewan and beyond. The Crees, unless goaded beyond discretion or instigated by a particularly daring leader, kept to their Saskatchewan country and to the south-east. Not even the Hudson's Bay Company had managed to penetrate the Blackfoot country proper, and stay. Its ventures at Old Bow Fort and Chesterfield House had been unsuccessful and were withdrawn. The legends of

the Crees were all interwoven with the successes of their bravest and most cunning chiefs against their foes or their allies in the Blackfoot Confederacy—the Bloods, the Peigans and the Sarcees; there was no legend of their defeats, unless a burning hatred of their enemies was its expression. Nor did the Crees dissimulate their hatred. The tribe, which in sign language was represented by two tongues—liars—was truthful enough in this one respect at least.

But the advent of government had changed all this. With the transfer of the title to the Northwest from the Hudson's Bay Company to Canada an instant change took place. Before six years had elapsed treaties with both tribes had been concluded which restricted each to its own district; another seven years saw almost all the tribes located on their allotted reserves. With the prairies cleared of the roaming marauders an influx of settlers took place. The new railway spanning the plains cut through the heart of the Blackfoot country. The buffalo disappeared forever. Not until then did the Indians of the plains realize how completely they had been their complement. The noble, if unappreciated animals, had provided their tents, their blankets and beds, boats and daily food, powder flasks, bow-strings, lariats, saddles, bridles, reins, bits and even the parchment upon which they recorded their history. Their seemingly inexhaustible numbers had been proof of a legend that the Indians would never want so long as they enjoyed the favour of the Great Spirit. And now they were gone. The Indians who had signed treaty but had not yet accepted the restrictions imposed by confinement on reserves experienced actual distress; those who still held out against treaty were destitute. Their privations forced both classes into line with their more tractable brothers who obtained some relief on the reserves.

Most obdurate of all the chiefs was Big Bear, powerful leader of the plains Crees. With a camp of 500 lodges, all in

wretched condition, he remained obstinate. In 1879 he refused treaty because of the penal clause respecting hanging; in 1882 he led his followers to the vicinity of Fort Walsh, but refused government assistance to go north to Fort Pitt, his own district, where it was proposed to establish new reserves. The band continued their miserable attempts to gain a livelihood from hunting on the prairie but cold weather and insufficient food wore them down and they finally submitted. Big Bear signed treaty and promised to go north the following spring. The old chief knew that his days of freedom to wander where his fancy led were almost at an end. The treaty money and provisions gave him a brief respite, but the pressure of the Mounted Police continued until finally he turned with his band toward the Saskatchewan. The relief felt in the south at their departure was equalled only by the apprehension of the settlers and authorities in the north at their arrival. All along the Saskatchewan there was a feeling that events were shaping themselves for a crisis. The half-breeds were murmuring; the Indians were sullen, angry and hungry; the instinctive sympathy of one for the other was disturbing.

It was not long before Big Bear's followers made their presence felt at Fort Pitt. In September, 1883, their attitude was so threatening that a force of twenty-five Mounted Police under Inspector Dickens was sent there to establish a post. The following year a separate detachment of five men was sent to Frog Lake, thirty-five miles north, a little hamlet recently established where traders, Indian Department officials and missionaries served the needs of the numerous Indians living in the vicinity. Another reserve, that of Onion Lake, was between the two places.

Big Bear did not remain in the district. In a few months his band was scattered all over the country hunting. Again he had temporized and promised to choose his reserve soon. With the departure of the Cree chief and his quarrelsome fol-

lowers the settlement at Fort Pitt recovered its optimism. The people, with few exceptions, felt that their fear had been unfounded. After all, the Indians at Frog Lake were prospering and contented on their reserves, and the presence of the police was an assurance that Big Bear would be kept in hand were he to return. The officer commanding the Mounted Police thought differently; he had information which increased rather than reduced his fears—fears of one who was not a novice at the game.

Inspector Francis Jeffrey Dickens had had wide and varied experience in his present line of work. It was a long stretch from the literary circle of his illustrious father, Charles Dickens, at Gad's Hill to the office of District Superintendent of the Bengal Police in India; then, after a sorrowful return to England, occasioned by his father's death, a still longer move to the prairies and forests of the new world. The problems, however, were not dissimilar. The tension of the decade or so following the Indian Mutiny and the necessity for tact and understanding in dealing with the natives had almost their replicas in the present situation in Canada.

The Inspector's service in the North West Mounted Police, dating from November, 1874, had carried him from Winnipeg to Swan River, the Saskatchewan country, Fort Walsh, Fort MacLeod and now back to the great river. His duties had been a reflection of the state of the country; his contact with the Indians continuous. He had seen ugly situations arise; occasions when the murderous rage of the red men had been curbed only by the coolness and determination of the police opposing them. The police had been fortunate, he knew. So had the West; much more than it realized. Courage and determination would not always suffice. And there was no set formula for all occasions: the iron of firm adherence to a given course must occasionally yield to the elasticity of compromise. The strain of decision was wearing.

An incident at Blackfoot Crossing in 1881 often came back to his mind. The police under his command had arrested a minor chief for shooting at a white man. Immediately they were surrounded by a large number of threatening Blackfeet demanding the prisoner's release. The position of his party had been hopeless, greatly outnumbered as they were and without defences of any kind other than their arms. He had had to decide. Stubborn refusal to see the situation would have been bravado—and suicide. Chance intervened. Crowfoot, mighty chief of all the Blackfeet, had appeared, had pledged himself to procure the prisoner's presence whenever called upon. Crowfoot was a chief of demonstrated honour. It was a way out. Without loss of dignity he had been able to agree to the course suggested, for the time being. But the moral effect was bad; such a precedent must not be permitted. A senior officer of the Force had therefore been sent with reinforcements, after defences had been prepared, to seize the prisoner from the exultant Blackfeet and to try him for his offence. This time iron determination succeeded; the prisoner was taken into custody, and removed for trial. The Indians had been overawed.

Another similar incident had recently occurred near Battleford. He had not been there but the senior officer of the Blackfoot episode had played a like rôle. The same opposition had developed; the first attempt to arrest had failed in the face of taunting resistance. Again a larger force had accomplished the seemingly impossible, and no bloodshed had resulted. An unexplainable something, almost a superstitious awe of the intrepidity of the police, had kept the twitching fingers of the "Thirst Dance" maddened braves from the fatal tug at the triggers which would have precipitated bloody chaos.

Big Bear had been there. Big Bear! The name had come to have a sinister ring in his ears. His actions defied analysis. Was he the hypocritical schemer that some believed him to be, or were his professions of good faith and good intentions

genuine? In any event, there was not even assumed friendliness in the manners of some of his followers, of some of his sons. There were those who in their desire to reassure themselves urged that he was peaceful; that in time he would settle down with his followers on a reserve, as most of the Crees already had done. Perhaps! But there were many signs to the contrary. Why had he met Louis Riel, the Métis leader back from his exile in the United States, a few weeks after the Battleford disturbance? What was behind these conferences with Poundmaker and other chiefs? It seemed more than a coincidence that trouble had followed in the wake of his tents like a shadow.

It was true that the Cree chief had again signed treaty the preceding October and had promised definitely to select his reserve when the snow went. But that was only after interminable argument and explanation, after firm resistance to impertinent demands. The demands—was it significant?—had been made by Little Poplar, a minor chief really outside of Big Bear's fold. The Bear himself had been violently abusive; had assailed the Hudson's Bay Company with bitter invective and had repudiated the debts of his followers to the Company. Strangely enough, as soon as the treaty money was paid over the Crees had settled all their debts, and in a short time had spent more than \$1000.00 at the store. At the ensuing big dance given by the Company the Indians had seemed good natured again.

Now they were at Frog Lake and, as latest reports showed, in utterly wretched condition, poorly clothed, and destitute of food, except when supplied with provisions by the Indian Agent there. Even the horses were suffering and several had died. No big game had been shot at Frog Lake and to obtain the necessities of life Big Bear's followers had been compelled to submit to the implications of Agent Quinn's dictum: "No work, no food." As a result they had reluctantly

agreed to work at cutting wood. It was ominous indeed that in such a condition and with no big game to shoot, they had, at the expense of their bellies, been buying fixed ammunition and hoarding it away. An urgent recommendation to the Government that this practice be prohibited and that only powder and shot be sold had produced no effect.

Neither by sign nor by action did Inspector Dickens show his misgivings. To the people of Fort Pitt he continued to be the silent, slightly gloomy individual of their acquaintance; a man whose seeming habit of introspection was undoubtedly enhanced by the affliction of deafness daily growing more apparent. His familiar, slight figure with the distinctive reddish beard was a part of their daily life. His reports to his superiors were more revealing; each reflected his watchfulness for a sign which would confirm his doubts and fears, and summarized the observations of his secret scouts and the regular members of his command. A steady stream of despatches passed between Frog Lake, Fort Pitt, and Battleford.

On February 20th Big Bear and Lone Man, his son-in-law, accompanied by the Councillors of the band, appeared at Fort Pitt to complain about Agent Quinn's action at Frog Lake in warning them that until they selected a reserve they would have to work for their food as the other Indians had to do. They received short shrift but took advantage of their visit to obtain provisions from the Hudson's Bay Company in return for their services in freighting supplies back to Frog Lake. Immediately following this the police reports from the scouts, the men on patrol and at Frog Lake became more encouraging. It began to leak out that all was not peace and harmony in the ranks of Big Bear's followers; that a number were talking about joining other bands on the reserves at Frog Lake and had even made formal application to that end. Big Bear continued stubborn. To all importunities he replied that he was "going slowly, slowly" to his reserve, and muttered

something about seeing the lieutenant-governor before he finally decided.

The reports received at Fort Pitt from the other Mounted Police posts and detachments along the Saskatchewan, particularly those to the east, were not reassuring. From every direction word came of uneasiness and unrest among the Indians and half-breeds. An unusual activity for the season was being shown in the movement of both classes from one Indian reserve or half-breed settlement to another. The object and justification of all such movements outside of their own localities were carefully investigated in the Fort Pitt district. Two Indians—God's Wind and Little White Bear—were the latest to receive the Inspector's personal attention. They had arrived from Little Pine's reserve, situated south-east of Pitt, and were on a visit to the reserves at Frog Lake and others in the direction of Edmonton, on their way from the Blackfoot country to the south. After a detention of four days they were permitted to proceed.

On the surface life moved with monotonous regularity. The officers' new quarters were "muddled"—an operation involving the discriminate use of mud and straw; the buildings and corrals were repaired; riding instruction was given the men; inspection of barracks at regular intervals; reports and returns. The significant incidents of each day were duly recorded in Inspector Dickens' diary.

Wednesday, March 4, (1885).

Fine weather.

Todd (Halfbreed) trader arrived from Battleford en route to Frog Lake. Wells and Baker (breeds) arrived from B'ford en route to Frog Lake with flour for the Indian Dept. D.L.S. Laurie arrived from Frog Lake.¹

¹Evidently one of the Government surveyors sent out along the Saskatchewan.

Thursday, March 5.

Fine weather. Snow fell during night. J. Pritchard and H. Quinn² arrived from Frog Lake en route to B'frd. D.L.S. Laurie left for B'frd. P. Ballandyne arrived from B'frd. M. McDonald³ arrived from B'frd with freight for the Hudson's Bay Co'y.

Friday, March 6.

Fine weather. P. Ballandyne left for Frog Lake. Wells and Baker (freighters) returned to B'frd.

Saturday, March 7.

Fine weather. General fatigue. Freighters (Wells and Baker) returned to B'frd from Frog Lake.⁴

Sunday, March 8.

Fine weather. Indians arrived from Island Lake to trade.

Monday, March 9.

Fine weather, but cold. Mr. Cameron (H. B. Co'y)⁵ arrived from Frog Lake.

Tuesday, March 10.

Dull weather and cold. Indians (freighters) arrived from Frog Lake for freight for H. B. Co'y. Lucky Man's son returned from B'frd.⁶

Wednesday, March 11.

Fine weather. Mr. Cameron returned to Frog Lake.

²Two Halfbreeds at Frog Lake who were to play important rôles in subsequent events.

³Malcolm McDonald, an ex-Mounted Police guide.

⁴Evidently a repetition of the previous day's entry in error.

⁵William Bleasdel Cameron, who was to play a unique rôle in subsequent events. He was an employee of the Hudson's Bay Company at this time and had formerly been an independent trader in the district. He has written a most vivid account of his experiences during this period. See *The War Trail of Big Bear*, by W. B. Cameron: Duckworth, and the Ryerson Press, 1927.

⁶Lucky Man was another Indian who was not induced to accept a reserve until 1882.

Thursday, March 12.

Fine weather. Louis Sayer's outfit of carts arrived from B'frd en route to Onion Lake for Barley.

Friday, March 13.

Fine weather. J. Pritchard and H. Quinn arrived from B'frd and left for Frog Lake.

Saturday, March 14.

Fine weather. Peter Ballantyne⁷ arrived from Frog Lake and reports Big Bear has promised to take a reserve 35 miles from Frog Lake on the Skn (Saskatchewan) river⁸ P. Sayer's outfit of carts with seed grain for I. D.⁹ passed en route to B'frd.

Sunday, March 15.

Rough weather. Mail arrived at 8 a.m. I.A. Quinn and F.I. Mann¹⁰ arrived for mail. Snow storm this evening.

Monday, March 16.

Fine weather. Rev. Chas. Quinney arrived from Onion Lake.¹¹ C. Bremner arrived from Battle River from trading with Salteaux Indians. P. Ballandyne with Big Bear's son left for B'frd.¹² Rev. Chas. Quinney returned to Onion Lake.

Tuesday, March 17.

Fine weather. Mail left for B'frd. Gondon and Downey arrived from B'frd with freight for Ind. Ag't., Frog Lake.

Wednesday, March 18.

Fine weather. Snow. Very hot. Snow melting fast.

⁷This name is spelled in various fashions in the diary.

⁸This was the first time Big Bear had mentioned a definite location.

⁹The name should, probably, read Louis Sayer, as in the entry of March 12; I. D. refers to the Indian Department.

¹⁰Farm Instructor Mann of the Indian Department at Onion Lake.

¹¹Church of England Missionary at Onion Lake.

¹²Big Bear had several sons. It is not known to which this entry refers.

Thursday, March 19.

Fine weather. Consts. Anderson and Tector returned from Frog Lake. Le Cotau arrives from Frog Lake to trade. Pembrum arrived from Turtle Lake with freight for H. B. Co'y. The Crane (Indian) arrived from Frog Lake en route to B'frd.

Friday, March 20.

Weather cold and dull. Mr. McLean¹³ left for Onion Lake.

Saturday, March 21.

Fine weather. J. Alexander (guide)¹⁴ left for Frog Lake on special duty.

Sunday, March 22.

Fine weather. Rev. Chas. Quinney arrived and held services.¹⁵

Monday, March 23.

Fine weather. Rev. Chas. Quinney returned home. Indian Pa-too-way-sic-owin left for B'frd with despatch for O.C. B'frd.¹⁶ Sayers and Nault (halfbreed freighters) arrived from B'frd. Rumours abroad to the effect that the Halfbreeds are in arms against the Government.¹⁷

Tuesday, March 24.

Fine weather. Indian Crooked Neck arrived from Onion

¹³W. J. McLean, the Chief District Officer for the Hudson's Bay Company at Fort Pitt.

¹⁴Josie Alexander, the Mounted Police scout and guide at Fort Pitt.

¹⁵Divine service was held irregularly at Fort Pitt. There was no clergyman stationed there permanently, but the Church of England and the Roman Catholic Church had their representatives on the adjacent reserves.

¹⁶This was evidently a rush message to the Officer Commanding the Mounted Police at Battleford, occasioned by the rumours being brought into the district.

¹⁷Although the first actual outbreak had not yet occurred, rumours of the actions of the Halfbreeds on the 17th and subsequently at Batoche were spreading about the country in distorted form like wildfire.

Lake to trade. Guide Josie Alexander returned from Frog Lake.

Wednesday, March 25.

Fine weather. Slight rain in morning. MacDonald left for Onion Lake for freight for H. B. Co'y. Indians Misto-nean¹⁸ and Toonis, the former a messenger, arrived from B'frd with despatch. Const. Anderson left for Frog Lake with despatches.

Thursday, March 26.¹⁹

Fine weather. Antoine Fontaine (messenger, arrived on horseback from B'ford. with despatches. Const. Cowan²⁰ and Guide J. Alexander left on horseback on special service returning in afternoon. Todd (trader) arrived from Frog Lake en route to B'frd. Corp. Sleight²¹ and Const. Anderson arrived from Frog Lake with Andre Nault (Breed) suspected of being a courier of Riel.²²

Friday, March 27.

Fine weather. Antoine Fontaine left for B'frd with despatches. Andre Nault examined by Insp. Dickens, who dismissed him with caution.²³ Ny-wag-o-sis (Indian) arrived from Onion Lake with potatoes for detachment.

Saturday, March 28.

Fine weather. Slight fall of snow during night. Corp.

¹⁸Evidently another police messenger bringing further reports.

¹⁹The Duck Lake engagement between the police force and the "breeds" took place on March 26th; the government force suffered severe losses and had to retire to avoid worse.

²⁰Const. Cowan gave his life in the later events at Fort Pitt.

²¹Corp. Sleight, the N.C.O. in charge of the Frog Lake detachment; he was later killed at Cut Knife Hill.

²²Andre Nault's part in inciting the Indians was never satisfactorily established. He was tried on this charge but sufficient evidence could not be adduced and he was acquitted.

²³Had Inspector Dickens known of the engagement at Duck Lake it is possible Nault would have been kept in custody.

Sleigh and Andre Nault left for B'frd.²⁴ Big Bear's son and Lucky Man's son arrived from B'frd.

Sunday, March 29.

Fine weather. J. Pritchard and P. Budreau arrived from Frog Lake for mail. Mail arrived from B'frd. Camped across river.

Monday, March 30.

Fine weather. Mail crossed river and distributed. Messenger Mis-trim-yan arrived from B'frd with despatches. Constable Anderson left for Frog Lake with despatch. News brought in of an engagement or skirmish between the police and the breeds in the vicinity of Carlton²⁵. Extra guards posted in and around the Fort during night.²⁶

Tuesday, March 31.

Cold weather. Mail left for B'frd. Corp. Sleigh and Frog Lake detachment arrived from Frog Lake.²⁷ Messenger Mis-trim-yan left for B'frd. Snow storm in evening.

Wednesday, April 1.

Fine morning. Heavy fall of snow during night. Sgt.

²⁴There is something wrong in this entry. Corp. Sleigh could not have gone to Battleford and returned between March 28th and 30th when he was at Frog Lake. He may have gone part of the way with Nault to make certain of the latter's destination.

²⁵This was the first definite word of the engagement at Duck Lake. The message came from Mr. Rae, Indian Agent at Battleford, and said that the country was in a state of rebellion, and that the Battleford Indians were greatly excited. It asked that every effort be made to prevent Big Bear and his people from starting for Battleford. Inspector Dickens at once sent word to Agent Quinn at Frog Lake advising him to come to Fort Pitt if he considered there was any serious danger, and offering to reinforce him in the event of his deciding to stay. Mr. Quinn replied that the Indians were perfectly quiet and that he was confident that he could keep them at Frog Lake by feeding them and treating them kindly.

²⁶From this date Fort Pitt was to all intents and purposes prepared for attack and in a state of siege.

²⁷The detachment at Frog Lake was ordered in by Agent Quinn, who wrote to Inspector Dickens that their presence excited the Indians there. News of the outbreak at Duck Lake had reached Big Bear almost as soon as it did Inspector Dickens.

Martin²⁸ left for Onion Lake returning in afternoon. Hudson's Bay teams left for Frog Lake with freight.

Thursday, April 2.

Fine morning. Const. Roby left for Onion Lake with team for lumber, returning in afternoon. He reports Indians very excited on reserve.

Friday, April 3.

Fine weather. Mr. Mann (F.I.), wife and family arrived from Onion Lake at 1 a.m., he reports that Indians at Frog Lake have massacred all the whites. Fatigue all night barricading Fort. Extra guards posted, etc. Henry Quinn arrived from Frog Lake having escaped the massacre, confirms reports of Indians risen. Mr. Quinney and wife arrived from Onion Lake escorted by Chief Saskatchewan.²⁹ Guide Josie Alexander left for B'frd with despatch.

Saturday, April 4.

Fine weather. Extra precautions taken to protect Fort. Johnny Saskatchewan arrived from B'frd with despatch, reports general rising throughout the country, left same morning for B'frd with despatch. Le Cotau (Poplar's brother) arrived from Onion Lake confirms report of massacre; reports H. B. Co'y employees safe, also the women. False alarm at 11.30, another at 4.³⁰

Sunday, April 5.

Necotan, Indian, arrived from Onion Lake with families. Reports Big Bear due at Bighills to-day, also that some of the Indians are inclined to leave him. Stables levelled in afternoon.³¹ False alarm during night.

²⁸Senior non-commissioned officer stationed at Fort Pitt.

²⁹The Indians at Onion Lake made no hostile move against the whites there; some of them were very friendly.

³⁰The tension at Fort Pitt during those days is well shown in the recurring false alarms.

³¹This was part of the preparations for placing Fort Pitt in a better state of defence.

Monday, April 6.

Severe snowstorm during night and morning. General systems adopted for general use. A Special Constable sworn in.³² Flying sentries taken off and sentries posted in each post through portholes. Nothing unusual to-day.

Tuesday, April 7.

Fine weather. Everything quiet last night. Magazine torn down. Little Poplar and 9 tepees arrived from B'frd; he asked for beef and provisions, proposed talking it over in morning.³³ Everything quiet during night.

Wednesday, April 8.

Fine weather. Grub taken over to Little Poplar. Stockade and Bastion built during day. (Bastion to command the back of Fort). Little Poplar reports that Indians have burnt houses at Onion Lake.³⁴ Nothing unusual last night.

Thursday, April 9.

Fine weather. Rev. Chas. Quinney left to scout across river, returning in morning. Indian Necotan persuaded Little Poplar to bring his camp to the bank of the river. Extra bastion built behind orderly room. Everything quiet during night.

Friday, April 10.

Fine weather. Francois Dufresne³⁵ and Necotan left to scout; they went as far as Onion Lake and report no Indians there. Indians burnt down farmhouse and priest's house before leaving, taking all provisions with exception of some 50 bags of flour. Mr. Quinney scouted across the river, reports

³²Henry Quinn, nephew of the Agent at Frog Lake, who had escaped from there on the 2nd of April. He had seen the whites made prisoners but was not a witness of any actual violence.

³³Little Poplar was the stormy petrel of the district, who was just as likely to be friendly as the reverse.

³⁴This was correct.

³⁵A Hudson's Bay Company half-breed employee.

3 tepees of Little Poplar's band missing. Nothing unusual during night.

Saturday, April 11.

Fine weather. Sentries posted outside during day. Started to build scow in day.³⁶ Horses exercised. Everything quiet last night.

Sunday, April 12.

Fine weather but windy. Large quantity ice drifted down river. Divine service in morning. Horses exercised in morning. Dogs very uneasy during night. Fire signals supposed to have been seen by No. 1 sentry (behind Mission House) during night.

Monday, April 13.

Fine weather. Consts. Loasby, Cowan and Quinn left on a scouting expedition to Frog Lake. A number of Indians arrived from Frog Lake, sent a letter demanding that police lay down their arms and leave the place, they report prisoners safe. Mr. Halpin³⁷ accompanied them acting as Secatary (sic). Mr. McLean parleyed with them and gave them grub. By contents of letter it appears 250 armed men are around Fort.³⁸ Chief Little Poplar crossed over to help McLean in pacifying Indians. Everything quiet during night.

Tuesday, April 14.

Very windy weather. Mr. McLean still parleying with Indians. During parley the three scouts out yesterday rode through the camp. Const. Cowan was shot dead and Loasby wounded in two places. Quinn got away. Indians were fired

³⁶The scow was a tacit admission that a retreat down the river might be necessary.

³⁷H. R. Halpin, post manager for the Hudson's Bay Company at Cold Lake, 40 miles north of Frog Lake, one of the prisoners of the Crees.

³⁸The total population of Fort Pitt at this time, including women and children, was probably under seventy. There were less than twenty-five Mounted Police there.

upon.³⁹ McLean and Dufresne taken prisoners. Indians threatened to burn fort tonight unless police left. After a great deal of danger got to the other side of river. All the white people and halfbreeds in Pitt went to the Indian Camp as prisoners.

Wednesday, April 15.

Very cold weather. Travelled.

The entries in a diary, however suggestive, are too succinct to do justice to the horrors which had taken place between March 31st and the bald statement under the date of April 15th—"travelled", itself just as non-revealing. The anxiety occasioned Inspector Dickens by the involuntary withdrawal of the Frog Lake detachment was not lessened by the receipt of information from other quarters. The reports brought in by the whites at Onion Lake were more than confirmed by Quinn's story of the virtual imprisonment of all the whites and some of the half-breeds there; by his statement that he had heard the sound of rifle fire while he was making his escape. Still nothing was definitely known regarding actual killings or, if any, the number involved. The Onion Lake report might be exaggerated, might be entirely untrue. The uncertainty was wracking. But the next few days left little doubt. Confirmation came from too many sources, including friendly Indians.

It was some time before the full story was learned in all its terrible details. The contest of wills between Agent Tom Quinn and Wandering Spirit, the war chief of the Crees, had provided the outlet for the Crees' frenzy. It came in all its fury on Holy Thursday, April 2nd. Wandering Spirit was thirsty for blood. The signs were many and ominous. All the whites and half-breeds recognized the danger signals. So did Quinn; but his position of authority among the Indians

³⁹By the inmates of the Fort.

would not permit him to accept their dictation. Already there had been several conflicts; but the climax came when the war chief ordered the Indian Agent to go to the Indians' camp. Quinn refused. Wandering Spirit shot him dead.

It was the signal. A general massacre broke out. It did not stop until nine men, including the two Roman Catholic missionaries—Fathers Fafard and Marchand—had been sacrificed. Cameron of the Hudson's Bay Company, the only white man, and a few half-breeds were made prisoners. Others from Onion Lake and Cold Lake were taken later. Big Bear had returned from the hunting the previous afternoon to find that the last semblance of authority had slipped from his hands during his absence. As soon as the shooting started he tried to stop it but his efforts were unavailing. His own son, Imasees, was the war chief's supporter, and the most eager of all the Crees for action against the whites.

The frantic efforts of the police and civilians at Fort Pitt to strengthen the defences during the next week must have been inspired by a premonition of what was actually to happen; and the work was a relief from the gnawing fears that refused to be recognized. With less than fifty as the total strength, their final step was clear in its inevitability, and the start to build a scow on the 11th of April indicated the best end they could hope for in ultimate flight down the river. While the defenders worked, a scouting party set out to learn what was taking place at Frog Lake.

The crisis was not long delayed. Scarcely had the scouts disappeared from sight when Big Bear's band appeared on the hillside behind the Fort. A peremptory message was sent forward; the police were to lay down their arms and surrender. Inspector Dickens' reply was curt, and his refusal equally decisive.

A council of the Indians met to consider the situation. A direct attack on the Fort, with its certain heavy losses, was not

an agreeable prospect, and the more moderate element urged that the police be permitted to retire without blood being shed. By this time there were two distinct factions in the Cree camp. The Woods Crees, inherently of a more peaceable inclination, viewed with disfavour the excesses of their more ferocious kinsmen from the plains; and on several occasions, principally in behalf of the white prisoners, they had not hesitated to assert themselves. As they greatly outnumbered Big Bear's band it was expedient at times for Wandering Spirit and Imasees to defer to their objections.

The restless, murderous malevolence of Wandering Spirit was something that few would ordinarily dare to arouse; but faced with the present determined resistance led by a trained, prepared force, all the wavering or more moderate factions united with Big Bear who seized the opportunity to endeavour to regain his ancient authority. Another message was sent notifying the police that they would be permitted to retire from the Fort without molestation. Inspector Dickens refused to alter his earlier decision.

With the failure of direct methods the natural cunning of the Crees asserted itself. Guile was more successful. By a ruse they made prisoners of W. J. McLean, chief district officer of the Hudson's Bay Company, and Francois Dufresne, the interpreter who accompanied him from the shelter of the Fort to conduct in the open the conference invited by the Indians.

The excitement occasioned by this betrayal had not subsided when a ghastly drama was enacted before the eyes of the watchers within the Fort. The scouts who had left the previous day for Frog Lake suddenly rode into the open, saw at once the danger of their position in the unexpected presence of the Indians they had thought were far behind, and attempted to race past the camp for the Fort, their only hope.

It was all over in a few breathless moments. Constable Cowan's horse balked, he dropped from the saddle and ran; a shot rang out and he dropped dead, shot through the heart. Lone Man, one of the Cree stalwarts, all the instincts of the Indian warrior and hunter aroused, mounted and spurred after Constable Loasby. Another shot, two more; wounded in both thighs, his horse down, Loasby collapsed. A hail of bullets from the Fort drove Lone Man away from the prey he believed to be dead. Loasby, with a last mighty effort, staggered to his feet and into the arms of the men from the Fort who had hurried to his assistance.⁴⁰ The third scout, Henry Quinn, the special constable, made his escape into the brush up the river, only to be captured the next morning, after a night of extreme hardship.⁴¹

The taste of blood aroused all the latent ferocity of the Crees. Their threats and preparations to attack and burn the Fort during the night, unless all the civilians surrendered and the police withdrew, were so impressive that McLean wrote to his wife advising her and all the Company employees to comply with the Indians' demands.

The day was cold and windy, and the possibilities presented by the threats of the besiegers were so terrible to contemplate that the civilians decided to follow McLean's advice, against that of Inspector Dickens.

With his responsibility for his charges removed, the police officer decided to abandon the Fort. Torn between grief for their fallen comrades and angry reluctance to retreat without striking a blow in return, the police began their preparations. After considerable difficulty the scow was launched and, carrying the wounded man with them, the garrison prepared to cross the river.

⁴⁰C. M. Loasby recovered from his wounds. He is still living, and resides in Vancouver.

⁴¹Henry Quinn owed his life to a minor chief of the Woods Crees who claimed him as his prisoner from Wandering Spirit.

The Saskatchewan was filled with great blocks of ice, and the current was swift. The scow let in water rapidly, and several times the awkward craft nearly swamped. Momentarily expecting attack, the crossing was finally effected, and camp made for the night. The sufferings of the first night were intense. It was extremely cold; the wet clothing of the men froze to their backs, and many were frost-bitten.

For six days the party continued its perilous journey. Progress was very slow. Camping at convenient islands, miserable with cold, wind and wet; constantly alert for roaming hostiles; hampered and endangered by the ice pressing against their clumsy craft; haunted by thoughts of what might be happening at Fort Pitt, they managed to make their way to Battleford. Their enthusiastic reception by the police and civilians, the strains of the band music that played them into the fort, were as nothing compared to their feelings of relief on their release from the hardships and anxieties of the past few weeks. The sweets of a brief respite from responsibility, a realization that their worries could be transferred to other shoulders acted as a tonic.

Battleford had had its own worries. For nearly a month it had been in a state of siege; all the townspeople had fled for protection, half a mile distant, until there were 530 persons sheltered within the enclosure. The arrival of an equal number of troops and police but a day or two before had been a joyful scene. Following their own experiences, the people could appreciate the plight of the Fort Pitt party.

Inspector Dickens expressed no emotion. The small, silent figure remained as taciturn as ever. But his thoughts could not have been cheerful. Once again he had been obliged to make a decision under harrowing circumstances, to see his judgment disregarded, and his wishes thwarted. He had no choice in the decision of the Fort Pitt civilians to go as prisoners to Big Bear's camp; his request of the whites at Frog Lake

to come under his protection had been refused. He could not have averted either of those tragedies; yet they had occurred. What would his superiors, his brother-officers, think? He soon learned, as did all Canada, that the general uprising along the Saskatchewan had not permitted of ordinary measures of defence. Duck Lake was one illustration; the retreat from Fort Carlton another; Fish Creek and others were still to happen.

Retribution for the horrors of Frog Lake, for the death of Cowan and the wounding of Loasby was not far away. On August 1st Wandering Spirit was delivered over at Battleford as a prisoner—to Inspector Dickens of all officers in the Force—on his way to the scaffold; a few months later the sentence of death was carried out against Miserable Man and other Frog Lake murderers; a few Indians, including Big Bear, were given penitentiary terms.

But the strain of the past few months, added to that of the previous ten years, had been too great for a constitution never robust. Inspector Dickens' deafness had become such a handicap that he withdrew from the Mounted Police soon after the Northwest troubles had subsided, in the hope of enjoying a rest before turning to other activities. In another manner than he expected was this hope realized. He died, suddenly, while on a visit to Moline, Illinois, on June 11th, 1886, at the age of forty-one. Another name on the roll of the pioneers who failed to reap the harvest of their sowing!

SCOTT, CARLYLE, DICKENS, AND CANADA

BY FRANK YEIGH

MANY famous British authors had interesting contacts with Canada, either by personal visits, as in the case of Tom Moore and Charles Dickens, or through relatives, as with Sir Walter Scott and Thomas Carlyle, each of whom had a brother resident for some years in the Dominion, or again with Dickens, whose son Francis Jeffrey was at one time a member of the Mounted Police force in the Northwest.

Sir Walter Scott's Canadian connection was through his brother Thomas who on giving up business in Edinburgh obtained a commission in 1810 in the Manx Fencibles, formed in the Isle of Man, and in the following year was appointed paymaster of the 70th regiment then stationed in Scotland. When it was transferred to Canada in 1813, due no doubt to the War of 1812-14, Thomas Scott came with it. Walter was not, however, enthusiastic over his brother's choice of a military career. "The Militia is but an idle man's employment," he wrote, "and I would fain hope you may, with your talents, find a more lucrative and active sphere of exertion." But that hope ended with its expression, for the paymaster continued to fill the position to which he was appointed for ten years and until his death, in Quebec, in 1823. According to Robertson's *Landmarks of Toronto* the 70th (Surrey) Regiment of Foot was recruited, chiefly in Scotland, as a second battalion of the 31st (Huntingdonshire) Foot. It left for Canada in August, 1813, returning to the Motherland in 1828, and coming to Canada again in 1841 where it remained until 1843.

During his school days in Edinburgh, Thomas was the guardian and protector of his younger and physically weaker brother, and in the brawls and fights that then characterized Scottish high school life, the two lads stood side by side. After

speaking of one of these boyish adventures, Sir Walter wrote: "Of five brothers, all healthy and promising, in a degree far beyond one whose infancy was visited by personal infirmity, and whose health after this period seemed long very precarious, I am, nevertheless, the only survivor. The best loved, and the best deserving to be loved, died before his day in a distant and foreign land."

There is an anecdote recorded during the youth of the two brothers. Walter was noted for his early and fervent piety. Thomas was obliged to wait Walter's time for starting to school. Thomas was always ready betimes, so as to have a bit of sport on the playground to start the day with, but Walter had his prayers to say—prayers that were, in the elder brother's estimation, unduly long, at least at such a time.

"Dod, Wattie," the waiting lad cried one morning, "canna ye come awa'?"

"I canna come till I have said my prayers," answered Walter.

"But can you no pray when you come hame to breakfast?" replied the unregenerate guardian.

Several letters passed between the brothers. One contains the following: "My dear Tom, I cannot acquiesce in your plan of settling in Canada. Should you remain there, you must consider your family as settlers in that state, and, as I cannot believe that it will remain very long separated from America, I should almost think this equal to depriving them of the advantages of British subjects." Such was the prophecy, as yet unfulfilled, uttered a few years after the close of the war of 1812-15, when the possibility of any organic union between Canada and the United States was more than remote.

Thomas Scott was, at one time, suspected of being the author of the *Waverley Novels*. Sir Walter refers to the allegation in a letter to Lady Abercorn, written December 28, 1816:

"I am truly glad that the tales have amused you. I can assure your ladyship your laudable curiosity about the author would not remain ungratified, but if Tom wrote these volumes, he has not put me in his secret. He has certainly powers, both of pathos and humour, and has also read a great deal of old-fashioned sort of reading, but I greatly doubt his possessing the steadiness of application necessary to write twelve or thirteen volumes in the space of two or three years; and, moreover, I do not see why he should so vigorously keep his secret."

The Laird of Abbotsford wrote feelingly "of poor Tom's death, in whom one leading fault—thoughtlessness—blemished so many good and noble qualities. His widow is returned here (Edinburgh) with two younger daughters—very good-looking girls and very clever and amusing. The elder had refused some good matches in Canada, which her mother seems rather to regret. The girls, though hurried through a greater part of their life along with a marching regiment, are so modest, well-bred and accomplished."

One of the few letters from Thomas to Walter gave an interesting glimpse of his Canadian experiences. One, written in 1815, reads: "We paddled 90 miles from sunrise to sunset (on the Upper St. Lawrence), shooting all the rapids in a style that would surprise any person unacquainted with the dexterity of the Indian. This favour I acquired from my situation amongst my tribe, being a Mohawk chief and warrior by adoption under the name of Assarapa. I prefer the manners of the native Indians to the insipid conversation of our own officers. The Chief of the Five Nations speaks twelve Indian languages, besides English, French, German and Spanish. He translated your 'Lady of the Lake' as well as the Scriptures, into Mohawk, and yet with the most polished manner of civilized life, he would not disdain to partake of the blood of his enemy at the banquet of sacrifice; yet I admire and love the man," and concludes with the wish that his famous

brother and this Indian Chief might meet—a wish to which Sir Walter would no doubt have warmly responded. To what extent English literature might thus have been enriched one can only imagine!

Wandering at random one summer day among the nooks and crannies and quaint corners of Old Quebec, I chanced upon the old Protestant cemetery, adjoining St. Matthew's Church of England, where lies the dust of many a forgotten councillor, military officer, and pioneer citizen. There, crowded among the moss-covered headstones, the eye caught sight of the grave of Thomas Scott, who died in the Citadel City. The lettering reads:

Sacred to the memory of
Thomas Scott, Esquire,
Late Paymaster of the 70th Regiment,
who departed this life, 4th February, 1823,
and his daughter,
Barbara Scott,
who died on the 5th October, 1821,
in the 8th year of her age.

Thomas Carlyle's interest in Canada (or in "America" as he mostly termed it) was through his brother Alexander—the "Alick" of the family, who crossed the seas in 1843 and settled near Brantford, where he became a highly-esteemed farmer. The brothers carried on a correspondence for nearly half a century, evidently based on a deep and enduring friendship. The decision to emigrate was discussed for years before the final break with Scotland was made, and the letters reveal the extent of the revolution involved in the migration of a family to the New World, especially in the 'Forties.' "You have not prospered in this our Home-land, tho' making a manful, long-continued effort to do it," wrote Thomas to "Alick" from Chelsea; "you resolve that there are other lands where

you may go and try anew. In America I will still trust to see you and the whole set of us, root and branch, even my Mother, for older Emigrants than she have gone. Your resolve, painful to me as it may well be, is one that I dare not say give up. God be with you and guide you whither it is right to go, my dear Brother."

But Alexander studied the matter for some years, opening meantime a shop in Ecclefechan. "It is a forlorn prospect," wrote Thomas, though five years were to pass before the business was sold, "to try the new country over the sea. It is a great and painful enterprise, but I trust, in Heaven, it may be a blessed one. Courage, my Brother, I anticipate great things for you in that new way of life. You are not to think it a final leave you are taking of any of us. Canada, by steam and other means, is coming daily closer to Britain. For my share I see not but it is likelier the whole of us may have to go out to you if times do not mend. Consider yourself as the harbinger and pioneer of the others, than as one cut off from them. I hope yet to see you in Canada some day, and sit by your hearth on ground that belongs to yourself and the Maker alone."

Then came the actual parting, which was no light matter. "The Mother bore her great sorrow with the firmness we have known in her, like a Christian and a brave woman." Arriving on this side of the Atlantic, Alexander was followed by his brother's friendly letters of advice and sympathy, including generous offers of financial help. "Canada you will no doubt find a place of difficulties, of drawbacks—what place on this Earth is not such! We wish you to be settled on a healthy place of your own—a piece of God's earth committed to your own free charge. It is a real blessing for a man that lives by tilling of the soil. In our next letter we hope to address you in some hadding of your own. It will be a little spot of light for us in that dim continent."

The letter from the sage of Chelsea to Alexander telling of the death of their mother is comparable to Barrie's tribute to Margaret Ogilvie for filial affection and moving description. "As the light failed and the breath lessened, she continued to whisper her prayers, forgetting none of us, going round by America now."

The years pass, and it is 1855. The world-famous author, besieged in Cheyne Row by visitors great and less great, writes in the same strain of affection and interest to his overseas brother, and repeats "It is one of my dreams that I shall perhaps have a sail to America," but the voyage never materialized and Thomas was to hear of the passing of his "dear Alick" e'er the time came for his own sun-setting.

The title of "bield" (Scottish for "shelter") was early given the Brant County homestead. "Better a wee bush than nae bield," quoted Thomas to "Alick", adding "but across the water, the same great sky envelopes us all." A box went from Scotland to Canada on one occasion. "Jane and I packed it ourselves—a Pilot coat, a Pilot hat, a cloak for Jenny, some books and other sundries. Inside is a tin coffer, with a lock, crammed with various articles." One can easily picture the excitement over the arrival, the opening of the box and the distribution of its mixed contents.

In another and a later letter the Chelsea sage wrote: "Well do I remember always the pair of little brown fists (probably fifty years ago now) which I noticed suddenly interfere in some battle I was fighting in the Ecclefechan streets, one summer afternoon, a memorable and pretty little phenomenon to me. God bless you all." While struggling against superior numbers in the Homeric battle of youth, young Thomas suddenly became aware that a doughty reinforcement had arrived in the shape of his little but sturdier brother who "with little fists like walnuts rained heavy blows on the enemy and so turned the tide of battle." It is an inter-

esting coincidence that both Scott and Carlyle thus treasured memories of the fisticuffs of childhood.

Probably few people are aware that Charlottetown boasts of a link with Thomas Carlyle. It was there in 1798 that Margaret Gordon was born, the grand-daughter of the first lieutenant-governor of Prince Edward Island who afterwards it is alleged became the first love of Carlyle. She is immortalized, it is claimed, as Blumine in *Sartor Resartus*, and is described by her biographer as being a young girl of great beauty and intelligence, who became Lady Bannerman, wife of a later lieutenant-governor of Prince Edward Island. Carlyle met her at Kirkcaldy in 1818 when, after the death of her father, she had left Charlottetown to live with an aunt in Scotland. While she admired Carlyle, she did not return his affection, but a very charming letter of hers to him is preserved.

Charles Dickens' contact with Canada was a brief visit in 1842 to Niagara Falls, Toronto, Kingston, Montreal and Quebec, which is chronicled in *American Notes*. What startling changes have taken place in the intervening years, so rapidly approaching the century mark! The novelist crossed the Atlantic in a "steam packet" of 1,200 tons, compared with a 50,000-ton liner of to-day. In a rough sea, "the planking of the paddle boxes had been torn sheer away; the wheels were exposed and bare and they whirled and dashed their spray about the decks at random." What a queer sight a paddle-box ocean liner would present to-day! And the eighteen days from Liverpool to Boston (with a call at Halifax) has shrunk to less than five in these speedy times.

Eagerly had he anticipated Niagara Falls, over which he revels in superlatives. After climbing down the slippery bank by the American Falls, he crossed on a "Maid of the Mist" then in commission, and found his way to the opposite shore. "I never stirred from the Canadian side, whither I had gone at first," he recorded. It was not until he came to Table Rock

that the Horse Shoe Falls came upon him in its full might and majesty. The first effect was a feeling of nearness to his Creator, and the enduring one, that of Peace—"Peace of Mind, tranquillity, calm recollection of the Dead, great thoughts of Eternal Rest and Happiness; nothing of gloom or terror. Niagara was at once stamped upon my heart, an Image of Beauty; to remain there, changeless and indelible, until its pulses cease to beat, for ever. . . . Always from its unfathomable grave arises that tremendous ghost of spray and mist which is never laid; which has haunted this place with the same dread solemnity since Darkness brooded on the deep, and that first flood before the Deluge—Light—came rushing on Creation at the Word of God."

The Table Rock of his day, thrusting its ledge so menacingly over the chasm, fell in later years with a resounding crash. There is a print extant that shows the disintegration and the narrow escape of an old-time cab and span of horses, pulled back by the terrified Jehu in the nick of time. The untidy bank of the Niagara and the unsightly structures facing it will be recalled by many an early visitor in contrast to the more satisfactory conditions of the present in the well-kept public park and drives.

The boat trip from Queenston to Toronto followed. Brock's monument was viewed at the time when it had been partially destroyed by a miscreant. It was now a melancholy ruin, with a long fragment of iron railing hanging dejectedly from its top. "It is beneath the dignity of England," he properly commented, "to allow a memorial raised in honor of one of her defenders to remain in this condition, in the very spot where he died." It was many years, however, before the broken shaft was replaced by the present imposing monument.

So Toronto was reached. Again what a gulf between the little town of the "forties" of less than twenty thousand inhabitants and the provincial metropolis of 1930, with over 700,000

population and covering an area five times that of 1842. But the observant tourist was pleased with what he saw. "The town is full of life and motion, bustle, business, and improvement. The streets are well paved and lighted with gas; the houses are large and good; the shops excellent."

In most of the places included in his Canadian tour, Dickens visited prisons and public institutions, indicating his interest in prison reform. Thus he noted that Toronto had a good stone prison, as well as a handsome Church, probably St. James Cathedral. Upper Canada College, standing on King and Simcoe Streets, won his admiration, while the first stone of a new college (King's—the forerunner of the University of Toronto) had been laid a few days previously.

Another packet carried the traveller to Kingston, calling at Port Hope and Cobourg—the latter "a cheerful thriving little town," as it still is, but not so little as then. Vast quantities of flour loaded at these ports—a thousand barrels on his boat—attracted his notice, but that was a long time ago, and freight transportation has taken on vastly different aspects since then.

He discovered "an admirable jail" in Kingston, where to-day he might have noted "an admirable penitentiary," as a magnified jail. One of the prisoners was a beautiful girl of twenty, who had been caught carrying secret despatches for the "rebels" of 1837-8 from Navy Island—"sometimes dressing as a girl, and carrying them in her stays; sometimes attiring herself as a boy, and secreting them in the lining of her hat." She had helped herself to "the first horse she could lay her hands on," and that offence had led to her commitment to jail. "She had quite a lovely face, . . . though there was a lurking devil in her bright eye, which looked out pretty sharply from between her prison bars." Why has not some Canadian author made the fair prisoner of 1842 the centre, or heroine, of a stirring tale? Dickens' journey through the Thousand Islands

formed a picture fraught with uncommon interest and pleasure, as it still does. But the portages, "over which the roads are bad, and the travelling slow, render the way between the towns of Montreal and Kingston somewhat tedious." The traveller's statement that "the night was dark and raw, and the way dreary enough; it was nearly ten o'clock when we reached the wharf, went on board, and so to bed," leaves much to the imagination.

In the morning he saw a gigantic raft, with thirty or forty wooden houses upon it, and at least as many flag masts, so that it looked like a nautical street. One asks again, where are the timber rafts of the last century? The Ottawa and St. Lawrence see few of them, and Wolfe's Cove and Sillery reveal nothing but the rotting cribs.

Montreal is given a bare column of notes, but they are comprehensive. Its population probably numbered less than 20,000 as against the million of to-day. The very large Catholic Church (Notre Dame) was but recently opened, with one of its towers still unfinished. In the open space in front "stands a solitary, grim-looking square-built tower" which was soon to be pulled down. He found the town, like Toronto, "full of life and bustle; and with granite quays remarkable for their beauty, strength and solidarity." What would he think of the ten miles of water front and the great piers and structures to-day? He also found the suburban drives attractive, especially one over a plank road five or six miles long—"and a famous road it is."

Then, as now, the river route to Quebec made a night's journey. A vivid impression was made by the Gibraltar of America; "its giddy heights; its citadel, suspended as it were in the air; its picturesque steep streets and frowning gateways; and the splendid view which burst upon the eye at every turn. All is at once unique and lasting."

While both Scott and Carlyle had a brother each in Canada, Dickens had a son — his third — Francis Jeffrey Dickens, who came to Canada shortly after his father's death in 1870. After spending a short time in Toronto, young Dickens, "filled with a reckless spirit of adventure" as a writer expressed it, felt the lure of the Northwest, which was, in the 'seventies, only emerging from its mystery as the Great Lone Land; and if he was searching for adventure, he was surely destined to find it in later years during the Rebellion of 1885. There could be no greater contrast than between the life of England and of London described by the great novelist and that experienced by two of his sons—the one, in the relatively wild Canadian West, or the other, Alfred Tennyson Dickens, an elder brother, on his sheep-farm in Australia.

In course of time Francis J. Dickens joined the Mounted Police Force, then only recently organized, and was appointed in 1874 one of its inspectors with the rank of Captain. He served through the period of the second Riel Rebellion, during which he had many stirring experiences, culminating in the attacks on Fort Pitt, in Northern Saskatchewan, by insurgent Indians and half-breeds, incited by Riel and his agents and spies.

The stirring story of Fort Pitt is vividly told in *The War Trail of Big Bear* by William Bleasdel Cameron, a survivor of the Frog Lake massacre and Fort Pitt capture and for several weeks a prisoner in Big Bear's camp. When Big Bear and his painted braves danced the war dance near Fort Pitt as a threatening demonstration, the stalwart red chief walked in stately fashion to Capt. Dickens and, in a patronizing way, held out his hand and exclaimed: "You are a man whom Manito made to be a chief. We like you; your heart is good." The police detachment was kept constantly under arms in anticipation of trouble during these "days of strained diplomacy," especially in connection with the treaty payments.

Already the Mounted Police were being defied by Indian leaders, such as Poundmaker and Big Bear, creating a situation that called for the utmost tact and patience. The Indians were holding frequent Sun and Thirst Dances for making braves, while the police were frequently insulted with epithets like "red-coat dogs."

Then followed the terrible tragedy of Frog Lake (a few miles from Fort Pitt) when the Indians, incited by the war-chief "Wandering Spirit," killed in cold blood no less than nine whites, sparing the lives of Cameron and two women, (whose experience as prisoners makes a moving story of itself). With the blood lust thus awakened, the excited tribesmen held a council of war regarding Fort Pitt, where Captain Dickens had a small force of thirty in a few unprotected wooden buildings.

On April 14, 1885, two weeks after the Frog Lake massacre, the turbulent warriors neared Fort Pitt, demanding its surrender and that the police give up their arms. The garrison had been warned of the attack and the settlers, gathered there for protection, were later advised to escape. Captain Dickens bravely replied to the challenge that he would hold the fort while there was a man able to point a gun. A second Indian war council was followed by an offer to permit the defenders to leave the fort without molestation. Dickens still refused to move, but there was no longer any good reason for attempting to hold out in the face of a force ten times larger. Retreat was therefore ordered; ammunition and food was placed on a scow and a start made across the Saskatchewan River. This is not the place to present the details of the experiences of that night and the following day for the "red-coat dogs." The scow nearly foundered, during a terrible storm and amid blocks of floating ice. The fleeing sufferers wondered if their red foes would treacherously attack them but, to the credit of Big Bear,

the more truculent members of his band were held in restraint as the little army struggled to safety.

This was Captain Dickens' last thrilling war experience with the rebellious red man. With the end of the uprising, the hanging of the Frog Lake murderers, and the imprisonment of others, peace came to the disturbed country. He was invalided from the Force in 1886, with a most creditable record, and in the same year passed on to "the Sand Hills" of the red man; to the mystery world of the Beyond of the pale face.

Thus three of the outstanding figures in English literature had their interests in the relatively far distant "colony" of a century ago or less, and because of it Canadians to-day possess that additional interest in the great trio: Scott; Carlyle; Dickens.

GETHSEMANE

In all men's eyes I search
And there is pain,
Like sunlight in a church,
A rainbow stain,

Mistrust and wounded love,
Fear of a kiss
Given in a shadowed grove—
Father, not this!

Of love that has betrayed,
Of sacrifice,
Of prayers that are not prayed,
Lost paradise.

Jesus, you cannot know
Man's deepest pain,
You have not felt the woe
Of traitor's gain.

Your perfect love was wrung
In agony,
In groves where birds are sung,
And sinlessly.

Heart pierced with pain of love,
Heart thus laid bare,
You still can look above,
Know God is there.

.

In all men's eyes I search
And there is pain,
Like sunlight in a church,
A coloured stain.

In children's morning eyes
You, God, are there,
Love, faith, sweet charities
Not seen elsewhere.

So are our souls of God—
 Ah, bitter strife!
 Our frames made from the sod
 And breathed to life.

Jesus, your lover's grief
 Gives you a heaven,
 For love has still belief
 In love thus given.

Judas, there is no woe
 Can equal this:
 They have no heaven who know
 Your bitterness.

A traitor's love . . . Oh, pain!
 Ah, misery!
 Was it for trifling gain?
 Or destiny?

.

There is no pain like yours,
 Belovedest,
 Judas in you abjures
 What you love best.

There is no charity
 Whose reach may span
 This double agony
 In heart of man.

X.

TEN YEARS OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

BY FREDERIC H. SOWARD

ON January 16, 1920, a group of seven men representing the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium, Brazil and Spain¹ met in Paris to set up the Council of the League of Nations. Their chairman, M. Beon Bourgeois, described their meeting as "the birth of a new world," but was careful to add, "We are here to represent responsible governments and, while realizing the grandeur of the work, we cannot ignore the inevitable difficulties in the enterprise we are trying to serve." It fell to the lot of Lord Curzon, embodiment *par excellence* of the old order, to deliver the oration upon open diplomacy and the reduction of armaments. Then the Council turned to consider its one item of business, the appointment of a commission to delimit the boundaries of the Saar valley. After these "stiffly formalistic" proceedings, lasting barely an hour, the Council adjourned. Such was the unpromising beginning of an institution which to-day is universally recognized as an integral part of the life of the "Great Society."

It is not surprising to find in the press and magazine comment of that day in England and the United States little reference to this first Council meeting. The whole world was seething with discontent and furnishing the press with far more dramatic items of interest. The very day that M. Bourgeois gave his little oration, Clemenceau the Tiger was being baulked of his prize, the Presidency of France, by a second-rate statesman. In south Ireland the grasp of Sinn Fein upon the country was being exhibited in the municipal elections. Italians were keeping Fiume in defiance of their government and the

¹Although Greece was to be a member of the Council, she had not at that time ratified the Treaty.

Supreme Council. In Eastern Europe, Russia and Poland were snarling at each other. At Washington, a crippled President remained grimly deaf to all entreaties from his staunchest friends and supporters to accept minor reservations to the Covenant of the League of Nations which might make possible the ratification of the Treaty of Versailles. Seven votes would have turned the scales but in the spirit of "No Surrender" of his Ulster ancestors Woodrow Wilson refused to bargain. To such a distracted world the *New Republic*, after describing the boredom of the guests and press representatives at the Council meeting, put the question, "Is it possible that the institution they launched is destined to play a great part in world history?" In London the *Nation*, in later years one of the League's staunchest friends, was bitterly sarcastic. "The League we believe exists. Its Council has even met."

Reading such comments and recalling the conditions of the time one marvels that the League came into existence and that its members accepted the obligations of the Covenant, obligations which even now startle statesmen and leader writers when they take the trouble to re-read the Covenant. It reveals more clearly the great service Woodrow Wilson rendered the world in insisting that the Covenant of the League must form an essential part of the Peace Treaties, and that it should be drafted at the same time as other sections of the treaties. He paid an enormous price for his victory, but to-day we salute his achievement. Even as unfriendly a critic of him as Mr. Winston Churchill admits that "the mighty foundation stone (of the League), shaped by the innumerable chisellings of merciful men the world over and swung into position by loyal and dexterous English pulleys, will bear for all time the legend, 'Well and truly laid by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States'."

Yet in giving the American statesman his due we should not overlook other factors which made the Covenant possible.

As General Smuts told his audience last November "its substance, its real being was the direct response to the measureless woes and the boundless hopes of the human race at the end of the world war. It was the child of the human race and of no individual or set of individuals." The inarticulate hope that their efforts might help to make this a war to end war buoyed up hundreds of thousands of soldiers in all the armies of the war and made easier the burden of anguished suspense for those whose duty it was at home to stand and wait. Because of these hopes the League represents a yearning for a moral alternative to war and a way of escape from its horror and destruction.

The League idea has its roots in the efforts of earlier idealists and philosophers to maintain or attain a world community. The tentative report of the Phillimore committee, set up in London in 1917 to study the project of a League, indicated that attention had been directed "mainly to the various proposals for a League of Nations which were formulated in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries." The men who drafted the Covenant had before them the experience of the nineteenth century, when the idea of a European concert to discuss problems of peace, the growth of arbitration (about 200 arbitration treaties were concluded between 1815 and 1900), and the creation after 1860 of international bureaus and commissions indicated the value of international coöperation. It was the Fabian society which first emphasized the importance of studying these movements and published studies of international government prepared by Mr. Leonard Woolf in a special supplement to the *New Statesman* during July, 1915. Later Mr. Woolf published his conclusions in a book entitled *International Government*, to which we are told part of the stress in the League Covenant upon technical organizations is to be attributed.

The makers of the Covenant had before them, likewise,

the unique experience in governing the world that had been acquired by the men who staffed such bodies as the Allied Maritime Transport Council. It is not a mere chance that Lord Cecil, who was Minister of Blockade in the British Cabinet in 1916, emphasized in his early League writings the vital importance of conference and coöperation. The practical experience of international administration that Sir Arthur Salter acquired during the war led him in his monograph upon Allied Shipping Control to speculate upon the task of the League in a manner which causes such a good judge as Professor Zimmern to call it the most valuable book yet written upon the League. Sir Arthur thought that the great value of the League would be in "an attempt to take public policy away from the few overstrained centres of excessive power and base it boldly and broadly on the general wishes and goodwill of the peoples of the world. It is morally a great act of faith. It is in one sense administratively a great effort of decentralization. It replaces centralization by coördination." His training had taught him the importance of civil servants as well as Cabinet ministers "dealing direct with each other and not through Foreign Offices." If the League encouraged such meetings he thought they should not be regarded as building a super-state but rather as creating a medium for expressing or summarizing national experiences and crystallizing them for the common good.

We need not dwell upon the evolution of the various clauses of the Covenant. That story has been recorded thoroughly for posterity in the massive volumes of Mr. David Hunter Miller's *Drafting of the Covenant*. As his book shows, the Covenant was for the most part of Anglo-American origin and bears the imprint of the theories of President Wilson, Lord Cecil and General Smuts. The first emphasized the League as an association for the guaranteeing of the security of its contracting members and is the author, in whole or in

part, of Articles Ten and Eleven. The second stressed the value of conferences and of supervising international technical organizations. He assisted also in devising a modicum of sanctions in response to the steady pressure of the French delegates and helped draft the clauses on arbitration. The South African statesman invented the idea of mandates, although it was applied in a manner contrary to his intentions, and was influential in creating the Assembly and Council with powers which deliberately overlapped. To the neutrals is due some of the stress upon a permanent court of international justice—in which Colonel House and Mr. Root were also interested—and the provisions for enlarging membership in the League. Despite the haste in drafting the Covenant its authors showed marked adroitness in weaving the various ideas into a pattern which met fairly adequately the wishes of all and which on doubtful points showed a discreet vagueness of language. As Professor C. K. Webster has said, "the Covenant like the Prayer Book was a compromise between two opposite points of view and the supporters of each can find in it postulates to support their creed." Such a flexibility has occasionally proved an embarrassment but, on the whole, the verdict must be that it proved of immense value in helping the League to surmount some of its early difficulties.

From 1920 until 1923 the League was chiefly preoccupied with the immediate problems assigned to it by the Covenant and arising out of the Treaty of Versailles. It had rival international organizations such as the Reparations Commission, the Supreme Council, and the Council of Ambassadors which had jurisdiction over the more serious questions arising out of the Peace Treaties and which drew the attention of the press and the presence of the important statesmen of the day. Mr. Brailsford rather cruelly says that in this period the League was "a well meaning irrelevance in Europe." But even granting its minor position the League found plenty to do. Thus

the second Council meeting, over which the late Lord Balfour presided in London, heard reports from its members upon such questions as the appointment of a High Commissioner for the free city of Danzig, and of the governing commission of the Saar valley. It considered plans for the creation of an advisory committee upon Transit and Communications, of the Health Bureau, and of the Permanent Court of International Justice. When the First Assembly met in November the Council had held ten meetings, taken cognizance of the disputes over the Aaland islands and Vilna and had convoked the first League conference of experts, the Brussels Financial Conference of September. Its report gave the Assembly ample to discuss while its members found themselves. Lord Cecil, then a delegate for South Africa, has described how the "moral atmosphere" of the meeting at first reflected the pall of fog which hung over Geneva and almost completely obscured Mont Blanc from view.

Probably the most important single reason for this depression was the verdict of the American Presidential election when President Wilson's plea for a "solemn referendum" upon the League of Nations had been answered by a seven million majority for Mr. Harding who stood for "America first", "normalcy" and a return to Republican principles of government. Although such a participant in the event as Mr. Coolidge has since assured us that he had doubts "if any particular mandate was given . . . on the question of the League of Nations and if that was the preponderant issue", it was clear that Europe and America were then agreed that the die was cast for non-participation by the United States in the institution for which it had been so largely responsible. The Harding administration in its first six months of office went out of its way to emphasize its dislike of the League and all its works. Correspondence from the League Secretariat went unanswered, invitations to the American group in the Hague

Arbitration Panels, sent through the American government in accordance with international courtesy, were undelivered for months and League publications were paid for with personal cheques lest the government might be compromised.

The disastrous effect of American abstention at the outset from the responsibilities of the peace can hardly be over-emphasized. It meant that the one strong power which might have spoken most freely in the Council for liberal and neutral opinion was absent. Not until 1922 was there a real exponent (Sweden) of an independent point of view. This made possible the noticeable French bias among almost all the Saar valley governing commission and the weakness from the beginning in handling the complaints of minorities. American defection also meant the automatic lapse of the Anglo-American treaty of guarantee to France, which had been offered to her in compensation for her disappointment about the Rhine frontier, and as a more realistic aid than the League of Nations. France consequently turned elsewhere to find allies and developed in a more acute form her "security complex" which has ever since motivated her foreign policy. For Great Britain the absence of the United States meant that the hope of a universal league was deferred and that the dangers of sanctions were even greater especially in so far as they should involve the application of a maritime blockade. The rejection of the Geneva Protocol was largely due to fear of Anglo-American complications over neutral rights at sea, while at times one suspects that British Ministers have been inclined to use the absence of America as a pretext for not accepting policies which they disliked. For all members the absence of the United States made their membership of a more optional nature and encouraged them to use threats of resignation to secure their own purposes. As Professor Rappard has so well put it, "Without America the League remains an association of nations which one may join or leave at discretion, whose

corporate solidarity is feeble and whose uncertain collective will may be disregarded with impunity, at least by any of its principal members." Finally, the League was much more European in outlook as a consequence of the verdict in 1920 and rather disinclined to appear too active in Latin America, over which fell the shadow of the Monroe Doctrine, or in the Far East in which the United States developed special interests. The League attitude upon the Tacna-Arica dispute and its reticence at the time of the Sino-Russian imbroglio in 1929 are cases in point. Perhaps the one virtue of American defection was that it forced the European members to attempt to solve their own problems as far as possible by themselves and, reinforced by economic conditions, has created among them an increasing sense of continental solidarity which finds expression in the idealized conception of a "United States of Europe."

To return to the First Assembly, the withdrawal of Argentina, piqued at the unwillingness of the Assembly to move rapidly towards admitting all the ex-enemy states, especially Germany, contributed to the general gloom. In Lord Cecil's words, "At first things moved stickily." The delegates watched one another with doubt and distrust. If any one took the initiative he was regarded with suspicion. The first signs of a corporate feeling appeared when the appeal for help from unhappy Armenia aroused a generous spirit of benevolence. From that moment the Assembly began to acquire a corporate consciousness. Probably its most important single action was the resolution which called for an annual meeting of the Assembly, a decision which advanced the conference idea far beyond British expectations in 1918. The admission of Austria and Bulgaria was the second important step which began the transformation of the League into something more than a League of Victors and Neutrals. With the entry into mem-

bership of Albania, Costa Rica, Finland and Luxemburg League membership rose to 48.

The next year the new members were from the Baltic—Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. It was not until 1922 that Hungary passed the barrier under the suspicious gaze of the Little Entente. In 1923 Abyssinia and the Irish Free State were admitted and in 1924 San Domingo, recently emerged from American occupation. When Germany was made a member in 1926 the League reached its maximum strength of 56 members. This dropped to 54 as the resignations of Costa Rica and Brazil took effect. We may, however, anticipate an early return to the 1926 figure when Egypt and Irak are made members.

The chief items on the credit side of the League ledger before 1923 are in the field of reconstruction and relief work. The devoted energies of Doctor Nansen were utilized to secure the return of 400,000 prisoners of war from Russia. The experience gained in refugee work there was used in helping the 700,000 Russian emigrés, the 1,500,000 Greek refugees after 1922 and smaller groups of Armenians and people of Asia Minor. Under that remarkable civil servant, Dr. Rajchmann, the Health Section struck out boldly to make war upon plague and disease the world over, beginning in 1920 with typhus in Poland and along the Russian frontier. Sir Arthur Salter and his associates of the Economic and Financial section were given a magnificent opportunity when Austria turned to the League as a last resort to escape ruin and dissolution. The skill with which the plans for financial reconstruction of Austria were drafted and the smoothness with which they worked launched the League upon activities from which Hungary, Greece, Bulgaria and Estonia benefited immensely. Because of their confidence in the methods of the commission bankers loaned these crippled states under a League guarantee \$400,000,000. The benefits of the League policy did not pass

unnoticed and such devices as the transfer clause in the Dawes report may be traced to the successful operation of such an expedient in the reconstruction of Hungary. By 1922 the Permanent Court of International Justice had become established although it was hampered by the unwillingness of the great powers to give it compulsory jurisdiction. It speedily gained respect by the impartiality of its decisions—on more than one occasion a judge has voted against his country—and by its obvious determination to limit its jurisdiction to the subjects upon which it was competent to render judgment. Before it had been in operation two years the Harding administration was preparing public opinion for entry into the World Court, an event which seems destined to reach consummation under Mr. Hoover. In these early years the Permanent Mandates Commission was feeling its way as a new experiment in the supervision of backward peoples. Its satisfactory response to the appeal of a black delegate from Hayti for an investigation into the treatment of native peoples in the South African mandate constituted a significant precedent.

The most thankless problems submitted to the League in these early years were those involving the delimitation of frontiers. Frequently the problem was referred to the League after the situation had already become critical because of the divergent views of the Great Powers, as in the case of Upper Silesia in 1921. Sometimes the dispute occurred where the League's writ could not easily run and where one of the participants had the friendly backing of a powerful League member, as in the unfortunate Vilna episode. In each case the League made the best of a bad job but it left a large section of German opinion hostile to it over Upper Silesia and it left Lithuania bitter at the failure of the League to help her effectively in her hour of need and at daggers drawn with a fellow League member. In other disputes over boundaries the League was more fortunate; respect for its authority began to

increase and the "Geneva atmosphere" commenced to make itself felt. This was evident at the time of the Corfu episode in 1923 when Italy cynically questioned the right of the League to tell a great power how to behave. The complication arising out of the exercise of concurrent jurisdiction by the League and the Council of Ambassadors, and the embarrassment of France enmeshed in the Ruhr episode gave Italy a partial victory but also enlightened her respecting the effectiveness of Geneva as a forum where public opinion could become vocal and vigorous even when a great power is concerned.

The Assembly of 1924 may be regarded as the turning point in the development of the League. The successful conclusion of the London reparations conference which adopted the Dawes Plan meant that economically Europe was definitely on the road to recovery and that increasing political tranquillity might be expected. The appearance of both the British and French Prime Ministers for the first time meant a rise in the quality of national delegations that was thereafter maintained as the following table based upon Professor Rappard's figures show:

Year	Number of States represented	Number of Prime Ministers and Foreign Ministers Present	Percentage of these Ministers to number of delegates
1920.....	47	6	12.8
1921.....	52	8	15.4
1922.....	51	9	17.6
1923.....	50	6	12
1924.....	51	22	43.1
1925.....	50	17	34
1926.....	50	18	36
1927.....	49	23	44.6
1928.....	50	25	50
1929.....	53	29	54.7

For the first time the offer of a seat to Germany was formally discussed by a Great Power in a friendly manner and the Assembly warmly applauded Mr. MacDonald's reference to the empty chair. For the first time the Assembly dared to draft a treaty to close all the "gaps" in the Covenant and

to render more effective punishment of an aggressor state. The Protocol of Geneva, in its definition of an aggressor and in its stress upon compulsory arbitration and disarmament was of first-rate importance. It won the approval of almost all the continental nations including states as diverse in outlook as Poland and Hungary, Germany and France. It was given its *coup de grace* by the new Baldwin government of 1925 because of doubts as to its wisdom in view of American policy and because its logical rigidity disturbed the empirical Anglo-Saxon mind. Yet its guiding principles survived and were reflected in the local application of two of its ideas in the Locarno treaties of 1925 and in the drafting of the General Act in 1928.

If Sir Austin Chamberlain disappointed many continental statesmen by his views upon the Protocol, compulsory arbitration and the optional clause of the World Court, he is entitled to the greatest praise for establishing the precedent that the British Foreign Minister regularly attends all Council and Assembly meetings, a precedent which Mr. Henderson observed despite the close proximity of the Council meeting and the London Naval conference in 1930. His presence meant the attendance in turn of the Foreign Ministers or powerful deputies from the other Great Powers and helped to accentuate the progressive dessication of those rival international bodies to which reference has already been made. Although at times his obvious preference for conversation *à trois* with Dr. Stresemann and M. Briand savoured somewhat of the old diplomacy, the principle he established in his careful attention to the work of the League was most beneficial.

Since 1924 the League has had its occasional reverses, such as the fiasco of the Extraordinary Assembly in 1926, but it has steadily grown in power and influence. It has had to mark time when powerful members wished to go slowly, but the prophets of gloom have been much less busy with predict-

ing its demise than in the early post-war years. The League has achieved coöperation with non-member states like the United States and Russia upon many questions until the presence of their delegates at conferences on disarmament or on economic or social questions has ceased to arouse special comment. The government of the United States which ignored it in 1920 now deposits its ratifications of treaties with it. The Tenth Assembly was notable for the variety and diversity of questions raised by the delegates for the new technical and political investigations authorized. For the first time since 1920 a member state dared to raise the question of the right to revise treaties under Article Nineteen of the Covenant. Lord Cecil, who returned in something approaching triumph to the Tenth Assembly, noticed the disappearance "of merely frothy tributes to first principles of peace" and the increasing tendency to discuss serious questions realistically. The League had come into its own as the indispensable factor in international coöperation.

In his brilliant little book *The Ordeal of this Generation* Gilbert Murray stresses the fact that "the system of conference plus a permanent secretariat is the real essence of the League." This has been the most important lesson that statesmen have learned to date. For the first time in the history of the world leading statesmen are meeting regularly at least once and sometimes four and five times a year. Both Lord Grey and Dr. Stresemann have declared that had such a system of conference existed in 1914 the World War might have been averted.

Charles Lamb has told us that it is hard to hate a man you know and there is little doubt that friendships, or at least mutual appreciations of each other's problems, have frequently developed among European statesmen as a result of their Geneva visits. The growing practice of holding, before or during the Assembly, a conference of the members of the

British Commonwealth of Nations, of Latin American states, of the Little Entente and of the Scandinavian bloc is an interesting evolution of the conference system along regional or continental lines that is bound to lead to important developments. The value of the conference method is not only appreciated by statesmen but by civil servants, business men and experts who gather in the various committees and conferences at Geneva of which there are on an average at least two a week. One meeting requires the presence of a civil servant from the British Ministry of Labour; the next sees the appearance of a Colonial office representative; the third, an Inspector from the Ministry of Mines, and thus indefinitely until the distinction between foreign and domestic affairs becomes almost transparent. It was this feature that most impressed Bernard Shaw who saw in the League "a new school for international diplomacy as against old Foreign Office diplomacy."

These conferences have also demonstrated the truth of the ingenious definition of the League as "the maximum of coöperation between the nations at any given time." It is so easy to fall into the fallacy of regarding the League as a thing in itself and to overlook the fact that its real centre of action is not Geneva but the capitals of its 54 member states. Critics, especially in the United States, will savagely condemn British, French or Italian policy and then ask impatiently why the League does not do something about it, but a brief study of the Covenant and attendance at a League conference would cure most of the delusions implied in such criticism. The League lives and moves and has its being as its members are prepared to coöperate and to make sacrifices for a common good. The Secretariat has learned much about the technique of holding successful conferences and has found the "Geneva atmosphere" of real assistance in inducing delegates to retreat from a stiffly nationalistic position, but it has more than once failed when a nation refused to coöperate. The single vote of

Persia blocked the approval of the Canadian interpretation of Article Ten. The veto of Brazil made impossible the admission of Germany in March, 1926. The opposition of France and Italy rendered virtually impotent the Tariff conference of March, 1930. The opposition of Great Britain suspended the enforcement of the Washington Eight Hours convention. Furthermore, even after a delegation has approved of a measure in Geneva it has still to run the gauntlet of national ratification when anything may happen. One of the most non-controversial of treaties, that which set up the Permanent Court of International Justice, has still to be ratified by the member states. Referring to this scandal of tardy non-ratification last autumn, Mr. William Graham for Great Britain pleaded for an enquiry and stated that "since 1920 some 45 conventions had been drawn up; no progress had been made in ratifying 22 of them and the remainder had not been ratified to anything like the extent desirable." It may be that the League will follow the example of British trade unions before the Trades Disputes Act of 1927 and require members to "contract out" rather than to "contract in."

The League conferences have greatly assisted the smaller states in giving them a chance to present their points of view upon world problems. As one reads the Assembly debates one comes away with a high respect for the outlook and statesmanship displayed year after year by delegations from Northern Europe and from some of the Central European states. Dr. Nansen, M. Politis and M. Motta have exerted an influence in Geneva out of all proportion to the position of their states. It was Lithuania which first suggested the desirability of amending the Covenant in accordance with the Peace Pact of Paris and it was Finland that inspired the Draft Treaty for Mutual Assistance. Dr. Nansen has pleaded year after year for the cause of compulsory arbitration and Dutch delegates have suggested more than once, despite the frowns of the Great

Powers, the establishment of a Permanent Minorities Commission along the lines of the Mandates Commission. Yet, admirable as has been the contribution of the small state, it should not blind the observer to the fact that its ideas will fall on stony ground in Geneva unless the Great Powers are willing to support them.

The League looks in particular to France and the British Empire for leadership and example. Japan has played a curiously passive rôle in Geneva; Germany still suffers from the aftermath of the World War and Italy is an uncertain quantity under Fascism. When Britain and France differ the League waits; when they are agreed the League advances. Senor Madariaga after seven years of observation has written of Britain in the League, "she must lead or she must drag; if she does not fall in with a movement she blocks it; if she falls in she leads it." The Tenth Assembly provided an excellent illustration of this truth. The Prime Minister of Great Britain announced that his country proposed to sign the optional clause of the Permanent Court and expressed the hope that this might be an optional clause assembly. Italy which had for years held back promptly hastened to score a minor triumph by actually signing before the British Government. Eighteen states signed the clause during the meeting of the Assembly thus raising the number of signatories to forty-two and giving the Court when ratifications are completed compulsory jurisdiction over every Great Power in the League but Japan and over every second-class power except Poland.

Largely because of the Conferences the Secretariat has expanded and developed until many observers consider it the most distinctive contribution of the League to international affairs. To it we owe a technique of research, a thoroughness of documentation and an international outlook that has impressed all who attend Geneva in any capacity. Professor Laski has even suggested that no diplomat should be attached

to a British legation of importance until he had first served two years in the Secretariat. Indeed the success of the Secretariat has made it an object of somewhat embarrassing solicitude to League members and provoked the enquiry into its personnel which the British government urged at the Tenth Assembly.

In our survey of these eventful years in League history we must not omit to ask the question "What has the League done to prevent war?" After all, that was meant to be, and should be, the primary purpose of the League and upon its success in this respect the League must ultimately be judged.

A study of the Covenant discloses five weapons which the League has available in its campaign against war:—publicity; the revision of treaties; the development of arbitration, using that word in its widest sense; sanctions, and disarmament. It is curious to note the varying degrees of success it has had with these five methods. Publicity has proved a tremendous asset and has steadily increased in importance. The open debates of the Assembly and, as a rule, of committees and of the Council have been a novel innovation in international conferences. The registration of over 4,000 treaties in Geneva has curbed to a marked extent the old fears of secret treaties. The steady improvement in press facilities and increase of newspaper interest has turned the spotlight of publicity upon troublesome questions and compelled governments to act circumspectly. Thus Bolivia and Paraguay were startled at the general semi-contemptuous annoyance with which the world heard of their boundary quarrels and greeted their mock heroics. The League bill of \$30,000 for cables at that time which informed all of its members of the situation was a wise extravagance. Up to the present the revision of treaties has not been used to redress grievances which might lead to war. Its possibilities were touched upon by the Chinese delegation in 1929 but there was rather an uneasy silence. General Smuts

has pleaded for its courageous adoption in the near future but an immediate response to his appeal need not be expected.

The League undoubtedly has greatly stimulated the rule of law as the alternative to war in international disputes. Under its auspices one hundred and thirty treaties of peaceful settlement have been concluded in the past ten years, half of them since 1927. Five nations have ratified the General Act which provides for a complete scheme of settling disputes through arbitration, judicial settlement and conciliation and six more have announced their intention of following the same course. At the last election the British Labour party endorsed this measure. The Permanent Court now holds sessions all the year round because of the increasing calls for its facilities and in securing more effective jurisdiction over its members. This year the League members will discuss a plan to make the Court a court of review and appeal from arbitration tribunals. This year too the League begins the codification of international law which has been so much broadened and developed by its procedure adopted during the last decade.

We do not know how the League will use sanctions as to date they have not been applied, but Jugo-Slavia in 1921 and Greece in 1925 weakened when faced with a possibility of their application. The tendency has been to stress conciliation and intervention under Article Eleven in an attempt to solve a dispute before it ends in war. It is very uncertain that the League could apply sanctions against a great power if, an unlikely occurrence, it deliberately defied the League and the Peace Pact of Paris and went to war in search of certain territory or in response to a grievance, real or imaginary. In 1925 Professor Rappard said quite frankly that "no responsible European statesman would venture to stake the reputation and the security of his country on the potential protection of the League in case of international disturbance." Yet the tendency to tone down sanctions still remains paramount and

has been intensified since the adoption by the world of the Peace Pact of Paris. President Hoover has declared that his country will never endorse a policy of sanctions and Mr. MacDonald's speech at the Tenth Assembly was an admission that the way to peace lies along a different path than that to which the Protocol of Geneva pointed in 1924.

Aware of this fact and dissatisfied by the situation, certain powers have put their faith in alliances and armaments until they could be assured of support from a world community. That is mainly the reason why the League record on disarmament is frankly disappointing. True, the Secretariat has acquired an invaluable collection of pertinent material and has supplied reams of foolscap to military experts to record potentials of war and to estimate the value of "hogs, fogs and bogs" in measuring a nation's military resources. The League's preparatory Commission on Disarmament has been meeting periodically since 1926 to draft a model treaty for general disarmament. Discussing its work in the appendix to his little book, *Naval Disarmament*, H. Wilson Harris writes tersely: "Decisions upon which agreement has been reached, *None*." The League has yet to acquire effective control of the private manufacture of munitions. It has yet to hear its chief members declare that they are less heavily armed than in 1913. According to Mr. Snowden only Germany possesses that enviable distinction and it was thrust upon her. It may be that the League will win a victory over armaments by pursuing the indirect path of securing coöperation on lesser things first. It may be that our present armament bill of \$5,500,000.-000 is the price we pay for the hates and fears created by the War and the Peace and that this sum will be reduced as the psychological atmosphere improves.

Much has been accomplished. Much more remains for the League to do. It must continue to live dangerously, to scorn delights and live laborious days. League members must

take their responsibilities more seriously, must send of their best to Geneva and must educate their people to a realization of the Unity of Civilization and the Brotherhood of Man. Year by year we are drifting farther away from war memories and perhaps the recent flood of war books is an attempt to recapture war recollections before they evade us. Unless the new generation that comes to share the privileges of citizenship after 1935 has learned to regard the League as an integral part of the world's life it may have to endure bitter and devastating experiences. Do our educators sufficiently appreciate this onerous task?

WHEAT IN THE CANADIAN WEST

BY T. W. GRINDLEY

AT one time or another in the agricultural history of almost every country in the world there has arisen the same difficult question which is at present exercising the minds of those who are attempting to influence the course of agricultural industry in Western Canada. Is it wise counsel to advocate the continued production of wheat on a major scale, or should our faith and practice be exemplified in the upbuilding of systems of mixed farming?

The murderous dispute between Cain and Abel probably began in a friendly argument on the merits of the varying methods of farming adopted by the two brothers—the tiller of the ground and the keeper of sheep. Ancient classical writers on agriculture—Cato, Virgil, Plato, and others—vigorously debated the question, but still it was left unsettled, and remained to disturb the peace in recurring cycles. In mediaeval England, where the humid climate permitted a wide choice of crops, wheat was favoured in the two-field and three-field systems of husbandry for several generations before the waning fertility and the exhortations of ‘scientific’ men brought about enclosures and finally more balanced farming. Sections of France and Italy followed the same course a half century later. In more recent times, countries having climatic conditions similar to Western Canada—Southern Russia, Argentina, and the American Middle West—have struck the same agricultural snag. Very little authoritative information has come out of Russia since the Revolution, but the toll of extensive wheat-growing was evident before the World War. One of the causes of the failure of communistic agriculture and the turn to small holdings was the failure of the land to

respond to continued wheat cultivation. The problem of depleted fertility has long been important and some of the best work on this subject has been done by Russian soil scientists. In the Argentine, wheat-growing started much later and the resultant problems of fertility are not yet so alarming. Large sections, however, have been abandoned because of the low yields of lands continuously cropped in years of drought.

In certain sections of Russia and Argentina, the failure of extensive wheat-growing means the failure of agriculture because the deserted land is unfit for grazing until the native grasses have slowly returned to suppress the weeds. In the American Middle West, however, different conditions are found. Here the failure of extensive wheat-growing led not to agricultural failure, but to success. As the pioneer belt, with its concomitant wheat-growing, moved across the United States from New England to the Mountains, it engendered conditions which naturally brought about the decline of the staple crop. The country filled up with settlers and townspeople, railways were built, and new markets opened. The advantages of the wheat crop, which fed the family and was easily transportable in pioneer days, disappeared and the various types of mixed farming were increasingly favoured. The propitious agricultural climate encouraged a wide range of crops, especially corn, oats, and other fodder. In such sections as north-western Minnesota and the Dakotas where the precipitation was not so bounteous, the farmers perforce clung to wheat which, although yields were lowered in these districts, still remains as the principal cash crop.

Western Canada is still mainly a pioneer region and its farmers are practising the type of farming common to that stage of a country's agricultural history. The first need of a new settler is a crop or crops which will provide the main part of his food, and which can easily be transported for sale to

provide the cash for the rest of his subsistence. The wheat crop admirably serves this purpose. It is the base of the staff of life and, enjoying a fairly constant world demand, is capable of ready sale. Because of its relatively great weight in proportion to its bulk, and of its high intrinsic value, it lends itself readily to transportation over long distances on a basis of commercial profit.

All the operations of the pioneer farmer are hampered by a time-preference which greatly favours the present and excludes thought of the future. He must live and it is only after he has established himself that he can take thought of the preservation of his land's fertility and can embark upon those investments of capital necessary to rotation of crops and to the raising of live stock. As the country becomes settled and railway branches are built, the farmer secures an advantageous market for varied products. The vanguard of these new conditions and the agriculture adapted to them are found in Manitoba at the present time. Wheat acreage is being continually supplanted in favour of corn, alfalfa, clover, coarse grains, and other component parts of a mixed farming programme. There are large districts, particularly in Saskatchewan, where wheat-farming will not be so easily displaced by mixed farming because climatic conditions favour wheat and are inimical to the growth of forage crops. In these regions, of course, the change will be postponed and the eventual type of farming will involve a shorter rotation and a greater number of wheat crops.

Viewing Western Canada as a whole during the past twenty years, the wheat crop, regarded absolutely, has continued to expand. Since Western Canada has been undergoing rapid development in this period, the statistics indicating the absolute change in wheat acreage mean very little; only by relating the change to the variation in population, in land utilization, in the area devoted to field crops, and in the num-

bers of live stock can the true place of wheat-farming in western agriculture be determined.

Although the wheat acreage increased from 2,495,474 to 21,805,314 (about 874 per cent.) according to the census figures of 1900 and 1926, this increase when expressed in relation to the increase of population and of occupied and improved land, is not so remarkable. The population increased from 419,512 to 2,067,393 (about 493 per cent.); wheat acreage per capita has increased, therefore, only 178 per cent., or from 5.9 to 10.5 acres. Relating the wheat crop to land utilization, it is found that in 1900 there were 162 acres of wheat per 1,000 acres of occupied land, 446 acres of wheat per 1,000 acres of improved land, and 693 acres of wheat per 1,000 acres of land in field crops. By 1926, these figures had changed to 245, 443, and 623 respectively, and it is apparent that although there are 83 more acres of wheat in every thousand acres of occupied land, there are three acres fewer of wheat in the average thousand acres of improved land, and 70 acres fewer of wheat in the average thousand acres of field crops. This suggests that the total occupied farm land of the West is being used in greater proportion for wheat, but of the land actually cropped, wheat has undergone a relative displacement of 70 acres in every thousand. The decrease in the number of acres of wheat in the improved land is hardly significant, but on further analysis it is found that although wheat constituted 44.6 per cent. of the improved acreage in 1900 and other field crops only 19.8 per cent., by 1926 the percentage in wheat had decreased to 44.3, while the percentage in other field crops had increased to 26.8.

Of the field crop area, wheat covered 6.3 per cent. in 1900 and 62.3 per cent. in 1926. An historical analysis of the provincial distribution supports the view that the agriculture on the older lands is being diversified, while on the new lands further west wheat is holding its place or gaining in favour.

Manitoba had 71.3 per cent. of her field crop area in wheat in 1900, 64.5 per cent. in 1906, and only 33.3 per cent. in 1926. Saskatchewan has maintained a high percentage of field crop area in wheat—74.3 in 1900, 64.7 in 1906, and 69.3 in 1926. Alberta, which had only 22.8 per cent. of her field crop area in wheat in 1900 and 24.4 per cent. in 1906, had increased this percentage to 67.2 in 1926. The area of fallow land has also increased in slightly greater proportions than the increase in wheat acreage. Since much of the increase in wheat acreage is due to new breaking, there is an evident tendency to fallow the older land. There is therefore justification for the conclusion that with the development of the country, wheat acreage is being supplanted and that there is a greater diversification in the utilization of improved and crop land. This conclusion does not seem justified in the form stated.

It is also interesting to compare the increase in live stock population of the West with the increase in wheat acreage. A measure of the changing relation of the grain and live stock enterprises is furnished by the number of acres of wheat and the numbers of head of the different kinds of live stock on the average western farm. In 1901, this supposed farm had 45.32 acres of wheat, 6.16 horses, 17.06 cattle, 3.31 sheep, and 3.63 swine. The 1911 figures reflected the displacement of ranches in Alberta and Saskatchewan, the average farm having 50.15 acres of wheat, 6.00 horses, only 9.08 cattle, 1.43 sheep and 3.58 swine. The 1926 census revealed an increase in all figures to 87.86 acres of wheat, 8.80 horses, 11.77 cattle, 3.02 sheep and 6.46 swine per farm. From these statistics it may be computed that the percentage change in wheat is much more favourable than in live stock, only swine showing a comparative increase. Both cattle and sheep show actual declines in the quarter century, and these declines are understated because the 1901 census was of March 31st and the 1926 census of June 1st.

The progress of mixed farming in Western Canada rests

mainly on cattle and swine. Sheep have 'come back' since their displacement with the ranches in the first decade of this century and are increasing both in farm and ranch flocks. Their numbers, however, are still relatively unimportant except in certain districts where ranging is possible. The great proportion of the horse population is utilized in the culture of grain and would be expected to increase in number with the increase in wheat acreage, tempered, however, by the recent mechanization of agriculture. The instability of beef cattle markets has limited cattle expansion, although dairy cattle have greatly increased. Recently, the seasonal surpluses of our rival dominions in the Antipodes have entered over an inadequate tariff barrier and taken much of the profit out of dairy production, reducing the butter output in Alberta particularly. The swine population of Western Canada has more than doubled in the past fifteen years; in Alberta significant increases are due to the relative cheapness of coarse grain and to the demand from the Pacific regions.

The explanation of this continued expansion of wheat production is found mainly in the climatic and economic conditions of the West—in a number of facts which have favoured the wheat crop relatively to other farm enterprises. Wheat-growing in Western Canada arose naturally and unavoidably, and from a purely economic and individual viewpoint its subsequent extension has likewise been natural and unavoidable. Reasons for the trend to wheat may logically be differentiated into initiating and continuing causes although elements entering into the former class may continue to operate after wheat culture has been started.

Fundamental reasons for the western farmer's choice of the wheat crop include, firstly, the natural adaptation of the crop to climatic and soil conditions; secondly, the great abundance and cheapness of unforested, fertile land, and the liberal manner in which it was distributed; and thirdly, its

excellent adaptation to frontier conditions characterized by scarcity of labour and capital. Among the secondary or continuing causes must be considered the transportation situation, the number and type of new marketing facilities, governmental and institutional help in production, the improvement in machinery suitable for large-scale production, war and post-war prices, the great fertility of the soil, continued low land values, and conformance with Canada's fiscal policy.

The resident of Western Canada knows only too well the dependence of the farmer on the weather. Prosperity in Western Canada rests on the agricultural industry, mainly on the season's wheat crop, and during the summer months there is a pronounced apotheosis of the Weather Man. Every vagary in the summer weather is discussed in its relation to the autumn's harvest. To the variable weather with its changes in amount and distribution of rainfall, in length of growing season, and in effective temperatures, the wheat crop has been found best adapted. Advances in plant-breeding and cultural investigation are confirming this conclusion. Just as New Zealand seems by nature designed for dairying and the American South for cotton-growing, so Western Canada is adapted for grain-growing. It has the area, soil, climate, people, geographic position and economic structure to make the greatest region of hard wheat production in the world.

The abundance of cheap, open land available to the early immigrant and the liberal homestead and pre-emption policy with which it was distributed undoubtedly encouraged the adoption of an extensive type of agriculture. The first railways tapped the Red River Valley and the open, short-grass plains of Saskatchewan, where land was most readily available to the plough and grain-drill. These lands also were more easily surveyed and the government could have them opened more expeditiously for settlement. The method of alternate land settlement in Western Canada also promoted extraordi-

nary wheat cultivation. When land was opened for homestead purposes, sections 8 and 26 in each township formed the land grant of the Hudson's Bay Company, and sections 11 and 29 were set aside as an endowment for purposes of education. In those areas which were under grant for purposes of selection to railway companies, each alternate section was granted to such companies and held by them for sale, while the other section was released by the government for homestead entry. Thus an uneven distribution of population over an extremely wide area resulted, whereby farms and settlements were unduly isolated, market organization rendered difficult and the cultivation of miscellaneous crops retarded by the lack of towns and markets. Consequently the farmers became specialists in the production of wheat.

Possibly the most potent force leading to the adoption of the wheat crop in Western Canada was its fitness for frontier and pioneer conditions. The outstanding economic characteristic of pioneer agriculture is the scarcity of labour and capital compared with the abundance of land. The new farmer chooses such crops as will utilize land and economize in labour and capital. Of all field crops, wheat supremely meets these conditions. Compared even with ranching, it has a place since the lesser capital outlay offsets the requisite increase of seasonal labour at harvest-time. The normal conditions of settlement find the new Canadian impoverished, and with his labour supply fixed and capital limited, more and quicker returns can be secured from wheat than from any other enterprise. The investment per acre is low in amount and short in duration, and the end of the crop season brings a sufficient supply of the staff of life at least. Wheat was the article in greatest demand and the practical legal tender and measure of value. Relatively high in value per unit of mass, it bore the long and difficult hauls to the nearest railway. The opening of the Canadian West came after the invention of the commonly used

agricultural implements of the present day. The implement dealers were much more ready to advance their wares on time payments than were the purveyors of the necessities of livestock agriculture. Foundation stock was hard to secure at a reasonable price and the returns from the saleable increase were not great for a number of years.

And so with the lurid lessons of every other extensive nation before her, Western Canada was compelled naturally and unavoidably to adopt the same wheat-growing policy, risking the destruction of her lands' fertility and postponing the establishment of what from time immemorial has been regarded as a permanent agriculture. The last half of the nineteenth century had seen the trial and failure of cropping land mainly with wheat in the American Middle West. It is significant that with the turn of the century many of these American farmers migrated to the cheap lands of the Canadian West to continue the farming practice which had failed them once. Of all the Canadian provinces, Alberta and Saskatchewan have the largest percentages of their population born in the United States. The great tide of American immigration really began in 1901 when Twin City capitalists secured some two million acres of Saskatchewan valley lands to offer as alternatives to the high-priced lands of the Middle-western States. The farmers who remained south of the line were those equipped with the capital necessary to farm high-priced land under mixed farming. The migrants were those who, either through lack of capital or lack of the temperament necessary to dairy or corn-and-hog farming, were content to try the wheat crop again on new lands. In practically every community of the West are found established American farmers drawn here by low-priced land and the promise of quick returns from wheat. Many of them have changed their farming methods somewhat, but for a long period after their arrival wheat was their sole resource. It seems that the economic motives of the present

must ever conquer social considerations of the future. The change does not come until economic limiting factors (such as weed growth and reduced fertility) bring powerful reminders of the need of new methods of agriculture.

But why, it may be asked, did the western farmer not turn from wheat-growing when the economic exigencies of the pioneer stage had passed? A great many of them, of course, have done so and for the remainder ample justification for a continued wheat-growing programme can be found in the economic, political, and social history of the West in this century. This introduces a discussion of the secondary or continuing causes of wheat-growing.

The continued expansion of the railway and highway systems has opened new lands to settlers and has attracted new communities of pioneers, compelled to grow wheat as their cash crop. Over a million and a half immigrants have arrived in the three prairie provinces in the period 1901 to 1926 inclusive. The fact that many of these immigrants are not 'farming-wise' attracts them to the easiest method of farming, which is wheat-growing. Many of them—for instance, the Mennonite colonies—are accustomed to grain-growing in their original homes, and continue the practice in the land of their adoption. The fact of a constantly continuing immigration retards the advance of western agriculture from the pioneer stage. A simple frontier economy has few wants and presents narrow market opportunities, and this constitutes a reactive cause operating against diversification.

It is apparent also that the wheat industry of the West has been encouraged to a greater extent than has the raising of live stock by governmental and institutional agencies. The greatest assistance has come in experimentation, grading, marketing, credit, and railway control. It can be demonstrated that the live stock industry has been aided in these ways also. It is probable that the encouragement of wheat

culture has been inadvertent and natural, but, nevertheless, it persists. The dependence of the West on wheat makes the slightest disturbance in the wheat industry a subject of especial governmental concern. A few instances of special help are worthy of mention. The introduction of the standard Marquis wheat and the newer earlier-maturing, rust-escaping varieties, has conceivably done more to encourage wheat-farming than all that the governments and institutions have done to help the live stock industry. When marketing difficulties were acute in the depression following the War, the government was quick to organize the Wheat Board of 1919, and subsequently to help the voluntary wheat pools. The grading of live stock has not received the attention accorded wheat, and the effectiveness of the system has consequently suffered. The perfection of the Canadian grain-marketing system is enviously regarded by wheat-producers all over the world, and is in great part due to the sensitiveness of governmental ears to wheat-marketing needs. When wet harvest weather threatened the quality of western grain, for instance, the establishment of expensive interior and seaboard drying elevators was almost immediate. It is good politics and, with some reservations, good business.

The alignment of the wheat-producers with the organized farmers' movement, involving elevator and pooling services and intimate association with the United Farmer and Progressive political bodies, has in many ways encouraged their advance. Credit conditions have often seemed inimical to live stock farming. Generally speaking, the provincial governments and the loan companies have been left to provide the long-term credit required in live stock farming, while the branch banks, under Dominion control, have financed needy wheat farmers with short-term credit. The various credit acts of the provincial governments unfortunately supplied a superfluity of long-term credit in the boom years before the World War. They have not been active recently and some of them,

really live-stock encouragement acts, have been abandoned. The banks, on the other hand, have served the wheat-grower much better. When the Bank Act needed revision to permit extension of time to harvest, the government again had its ear to the ground. Banks are also allowed by the Bank Act to expand their note issue in the crop-moving period—facilitating payment for wheat.

The markets available to the Western farmer for his wheat and live stock have often been in striking contrast during the past quarter century. The demand for wheat has been fairly steady, arising mainly from the same British and European source, and little subject to change from tariff legislation. The live stock market is subject to change from foreign competition which is largely unpredictable. The effective demand vacillates between Great Britain and the United States, and the uncertainty of British embargoes and American tariffs has long occasioned concern to Canadian stockmen. Whereas the War brought a great new demand to western wheat production and the farmer was able to make almost immediate and profitable response, the lesser demand for live stock evoked a lagging response, which grew to be more than proportionate to needs and became a significant factor in the subsequent slump in prices.

If the prices and purchasing power of Western Canada's main agricultural products are reviewed in the period since the outbreak of the World War, other potent reasons are found to justify the farmer's continuance of wheat production. It can be readily seen by scanning the course of agricultural prices that generally throughout the period of prosperity during the War, in the subsequent slump, and recent recovery, wheat has been the most satisfactory product from the standpoint of price. The records of prices and of purchasing power of the oat crop and the live stock enterprises and products

during this period, admittedly short, paint a gloomy picture. In the past the embargoes of the Mother Country and the tariff walls of the United States have been largely responsible for low demand, weak prices, lowered purchasing power, and lack of profit in live stock. Among the important products, butter and eggs have been continuously below wheat in both price and purchasing power since 1913. To discard these products from our farm economy on the evidence of such unsettled years is to discard our greatest hope in the establishment of a permanent agriculture. But the price factor is the most obvious and compelling force to the farmer, the one to which he is most sensitive in adapting his enterprises, and consequently a change from wheat can hardly be regarded as imminent. Even with the decline in wheat prices of the past four or five years, the acreage of wheat in western Canada has increased, and the large preparation of land in 1929 for the 1930 crop constitutes a record.

It is unavoidable that with the continued cultivation of wheat the attendant expenses of production should increase. Weeds multiply, plant diseases and insect pests threaten, soils become lighter and limited in organic matter and fibre and finally blow, and even the great original fertility of our soils must finally bow to soil laws and show lower yields. Over three thousand tons of nitrogen are exported from Canada in the annual wheat crop. Undoubtedly, whether through climatic conditions, reduced plant food supplies, or other natural limiting factors, yields over a sufficient period of time are lower now in each western province and over the entire West than they were at the commencement of wheat culture. To summarize these reductions, it should be noted that the ten-year averages of wheat yields in the first and last periods for which provincial statistics are available, have shown the following decreases:

Western Canada	.1906-15...	19.2 bu.	1919-28...	16.6 bu.	1920-29...	16.9 bu.
Manitoba1883-92*	19.8 bu.	1919-28...	15.9 bu.	1920-29...	15.8 bu.
Saskatchewan	. . .1905-14...	17.5 bu.	1919-28...	16.1 bu.	1920-29...	16.6 bu.
Alberta1906-15...	23.1 bu.	1919-28...	18.0 bu.	1920-29...	18.2 bu.

These reductions occurred in spite of the fact that more than twenty million new acres were brought under cultivation, that higher yielding varieties were introduced, and that better cultural methods were adopted. The lower yields, tending to increased expenses per bushel harvested, have been offset by a great improvement in the machinery of large scale production. Land values, moreover, have not undergone nearly the relative rise noticed in competing countries.

Stated generally, Canada's economic policy has been one of limited protection to eastern industry and minor branches of agriculture, with considerable importation over the tariff, and reliance on western agricultural exports to balance her international indebtedness. This outgrowth of old Colonial policy is being displaced by a national development, but it has had a two-fold significance in the encouragement of wheat farming. The tariff causes increased production and living expenses which lead farmers, perhaps unconsciously, into extractive farming to pay the added toll. This influence has often been overstated, but when the tariff is added to the land value tax, such taxes constitute a particular burden to western farmers because they do not correlate well with production and farm income, and because they cannot be shifted to any great degree. Since governmental policy has realized that reduction in the costs of marketing are necessary accompaniments to increases in the costs of production (by the price enhancements of a protective tariff), a great deal has been done to promote efficient marketing of the wheat crop on which Canada depends for the balance of her international indebtedness.

These economic conditions indicate that the question of present urgency is not whether the growing of wheat is a

*This is really only a 9-year average since the crop of 1888 was so damaged by frost that no statistics were prepared.

meritorious system, but whether the production of wheat is more profitable than other enterprises. Until the West is more developed, the choice of our type of agriculture is an economic and not a social question. Undoubtedly there is a lack of balance in western agriculture, evidenced not only in the production and marketing structures, but extending into the national economy of the whole Dominion. Certain direct effects of the great wheat production are notable in soil exhaustion, and the spread of weeds, soil drifting, insect pests and plant diseases. The devotion of an undue proportion of land to wheat culture has also a reprehensible effect on the internal economy of the farm. No modification of the production programme with a change in price is possible without disastrous results. When wheat is grown unduly, the factors of farm production are poorly utilized. There are likewise many indirect problems following in the wake of our mammoth wheat production which are pressing for attention. There is a serious attendant labour problem caused by the great demand for extra labour in the fall and the lack of industrial employment for grain farmers in the winter. This has a serious social aspect as any police officer will testify. The contemplation of our enormous transportation and marketing structure fully utilized for only a few months in the year is also alarming. Transportation problems persist in spite of continual attention. It is well known that the rush of grain export causes serious fluctuations in foreign exchange rates. The wheat crop has, perhaps, the greatest single effect on Canada's trade, and the fluctuation in the harvest involves considerable variation in Canada's internal and international trade. There is the added misgiving that Western Canada's prosperity depends through the wheat crop on world demand. Fortunately at present this demand is increasing, although the evident demand may be seasonably reduced by large domestic production in normally deficit countries, such as Europe experienced in 1929. One

must admit the disturbing viewpoints in Western Canada's growing specialization in the wheat crop.

These disturbing features, however, all appear as social considerations, and as probabilities of greater concern in the future. In the first part of this article was demonstrated the fact that the economic advantage of the individual farmer in the past and present amply justifies the expansion of wheat acreage. The whole debate appears as a clash in the relations of man with society, of the present with the future. Thus the subject is not one to be settled by appeal to either farmer or scientist. The farmer will be naturally influenced by the potent economic force of immediate self-interest, or in ordinary language, the rapid exploitation of the soil's resources by wheat growth. Nor can the problem be solved by appeal solely to the majority of scientific agriculturists of the country. They logically see the standpoint of the state and the future, failing usually in the realization that the farmer plans his crops to secure the greatest and quickest income in the easiest way. The two views have often been regarded as incompatible, and to some extent they are; therefore the solution will be featured by delay and compromise. Wheat-growing will persist until economic limitations make it impossible by making it unprofitable. Only then will western farming be conducted upon the recreative lines of an economically sound and permanent human industry.

THE CONTROL OF DISEASE

BY DR. J. H. McDERMOT

IT has been said that our greatest loss of wealth in Canada is due, not to what we spend, but to what we waste. It can be demonstrated that our greatest loss of life and health is due, not to inevitable, but to preventable illness. Of fifteen hundred maternal deaths that occurred in Canada, it is estimated that thirteen hundred were due to causes which might have been prevented, and, with respect to disease in general, there is good authority for the statement that nearly 70% of deaths are due to preventable causes. And death is not the only harmful consequence of illness. Loss of income, reduction sometimes to actual penury, loss of earning capacity, domestic privation, which especially affects the well-being and growth of children, with a train of invalidism and misery, are all due to disease. If these conditions are avoidable, the public interest demands that the problem should receive serious consideration.

Our point of view with regard to disease has changed completely in the last hundred years. The fatalistic idea that it was the will of Providence, to which we must submit, has been completely discarded, and we are beginning to feel resentful towards illness, rather than resigned. So, too, with the individualistic idea that illness was a man's own business. It is not a cheap sentimentality that leads us to concern ourselves as a community with the fact that Mr. Jones has tuberculosis, or that Mrs. Smith died of puerperal septicaemia. It is cold, calculating selfishness. Their afflictions hurt us directly, as does the fact of illness anywhere. We are learning that disease is unnecessary, that it is mainly preventable, and that, to a great extent, it is attributable to conditions entirely

beyond the control of the victim, but readily controllable by the community in which he lives.

There is a growing demand that sickness and its prevention should be dealt with by the community as a whole in a comprehensive and scientific manner, rather than by continual patching and *ad hoc* expedients. The day of *laissez faire* has passed and been succeeded by the present stage of experimentation along various lines, voluntary, semi-official, and official. This, we hope, will in turn give place to a scientific treatment of the problem of disease in its broader aspects.

The value of prevention needs no elaboration. Employers of labour have initiated welfare measures to improve and maintain the health of their employees and have found the expenditure which they involve to be profitable. One of the largest insurance companies in the United States, whose experiments extend over a period of ten or twelve years, has spent millions of dollars in welfare work among its policyholders and has found that it has reaped in the form of premiums a harvest of double the investment. The idea underlying our attitude to disease is thus changing from that of cure to that of prevention. Human nature, in its indolence and short-sightedness, seeks always a panacea; it wants a cure for cancer, when it should aim not to have cancer; it goes to the doctor to cure heart disease, diabetes, arteriosclerosis, when its aim should be to prevent these ills by observing the laws of health. It is a sad fact that few, if any, of these diseases are curable. By the time they are established the mischief is irreparable, though it might have been avoided. Barring accidents and the inevitable cessation of the functions of the physical organism that comes to every man, most disease is due to causes under our control. Infectious disease is an excellent example. We are told that the City of Hamilton, Ontario, by the simple elimination of diphtheria, through methods available to any city Health Department, has effected

a saving sufficient to pay for its whole health service. And the prevention of diphtheria also eliminates one important cause of heart disease, which, in turn, has been a chief cause of premature adult mortality. Other diseases are due to defective industrial conditions which are largely preventable. The conditions of community life—housing, sanitation—have their share of responsibility for physical well-being. These two causes of disease must be given due weight in the consideration of remedies for existing conditions.

The great triumphs of medicine have been directed—and will continue to be—not to the discovery of cures but to the prevention of disease. Few, indeed, are the discoveries of a curative nature. Antitoxin in diphtheria, tetanus, scarlet fever; salvarsan in syphilis; quinine in malaria; and some others, have saved thousands of lives and have been of immense value. But these are not the greatest victories. The prevention of diphtheria is more effectual than its cure—easier, cheaper, and safer. The discovery of the cause of malaria and yellow fever, and their prevention, built the Panama Canal, and made vast areas safe for human habitation. The use of typhoid vaccine, smallpox vaccine, and anti-tetanic serum saved countless thousands in the Great War. The discovery of antiseptics for the prevention of infection in surgery, the control of lying-in fever, not by cure but by prevention, have changed the face of the world. Thus any scheme for the control of disease must have prevention in its very forefront. Hitherto we have been obsessed with the need for treatment. This is partly because there is so much disease that must be treated now. Hospitals abound, clinics are multiplied, and all are increasingly inadequate to take care of the vast number of cases. If we are not to be swamped with the flood of sickness, we must obviously tackle the problem with the new weapon of prevention.

But this is only one side of the picture. There will always

be disease, despite the excellence of our preventive forces. And the treatment of disease is sadly in need of reform. It is a problem that must be faced by the community as a community matter, by the evolution of a coherent and organic plan, to replace our present haphazard and incoherent methods. The problem is largely economic in character. The burden of payment in sickness has been left to the individual to assume. Yet, it is a burden which is frequently beyond the power of the individual to carry. People who are well do not take the proper steps to preserve their health because they cannot afford the expense; people who are sick do not seek treatment early enough, or carry it out thoroughly, for the same reason. A question of this kind, involving the health of the community, the livelihood of thousands, and necessitating the expenditure of huge sums of money, requires careful, scientific research. We must inquire into causes fully, marshal and assort facts and lay down basic principles. This cannot be done in the space of a short article, but sufficient may be said to indicate lines that the investigation might follow.

Fortunately, a great deal of the spade work has already been done. Enquiries made in various parts of the world have yielded a mine of information, and we have a wealth of reports to study. Governments, labour organizations and private individuals have studied this question, and there is a remarkable unanimity about their conclusions. We have, in addition, one or two laboratory experiments by which to check our conclusions and findings. In considering the question of illness we may divide the community into three main classes, economically. The first is the well-to-do class, who can pay for all they need. For the purpose of this article we need not consider this class. They can avoid disease to a great extent, and when it comes they can seek treatment promptly and follow it thoroughly. It does not threaten their economic peace nor cripple them financially. The second class is the indigent.

These also we may pass by for the present. They usually receive care, and illness does not reduce them much lower in the scale. Their numbers, however, might be reduced, for their ranks are recruited largely from the wage-earners who fall by the wayside, frequently as a result of sickness which has impoverished them and curtailed, if not destroyed, their capacity to earn a livelihood.

Both these sections of the community are relatively small in number. The largest and most important group, however, is the wage-earning class, in which is included not only manual workers, but artisans of all kinds, factory and office workers, employees of stores, those whose incomes are below two, or even three thousand dollars a year—though the latter amount is seldom reached by this class.

It is the people in this category who are most seriously affected by sickness. They are more exposed to accident and illness, and are less able to guard against them in their daily life. They have no resources independent of their earnings, and when illness overtakes them it brings disaster. They are apt to struggle along when they should be in bed, hoping that they may be lucky enough to recover, when the person possessed of adequate means would go to bed promptly and call a doctor. Very often, as a result of this seeming necessity imposed on the wage-earner, a malady that might have been brief and mild becomes aggravated and issues in a serious illness that leaves permanent results. It would, therefore, seem most important to remove this cause for the neglect of illness. Fear of expense, likewise, inclines both doctor and patient to be satisfied with a minimum of therapeutic treatment and especially with a minimum of diagnostic methods. Modern methods of diagnosis are numerous and accurate, but, unfortunately, they are expensive. The reproach frequently levelled against the medical man that only 50% of his diagnoses are correct, even were it true, is not properly directed at him because it is not always

he, as much as the patient, who is responsible for mistakes. One hesitates to blame the patient for avoiding an expense which he knows he cannot afford. In these circumstances the treatment is apt to be less thorough than it should be and too restricted in time to get the best results. The patient, driven by the necessity of earning his bread, is inclined to go back to work too soon. His recovery is retarded, likewise, by the anxiety that besets the workman whose earning power is threatened lest his family should suffer from want, that bills should remain unpaid and that he should become involved in debt. The self-respecting man in any walk of life knows that, unless he pays his way, he is going to suffer in that sense of self-esteem that he values so highly. And beneath this is a consciousness that the only way to get the best service is to pay what it is worth. Apart from accepting charity, which he does not want, the only way to get the best diagnosis and treatment is to pay for it.

It is a tradition of the medical profession that its members do their work first and consider the question of payment afterwards; but it is a moot point whether this is pure altruism or merely a resigned acceptance of the *status quo*. It is much more pleasant from the doctor's point of view to be paid for his work and it is much better business. It is agreed that medical services should be paid for in some manner; our present system is unfair to the doctor, bad for the recipient of charity, and unfair to the rest of the community, since, in one way or another, the doctor must be paid a living wage.

It is useless to ask people within this third class to buy sickness insurance because it is much too expensive and beyond the range of their incomes. It is futile also to leave it to their voluntary effort. Statistics compiled by the Workmen's Compensation Board of British Columbia show that of some 300,000 cases coming within their purview less than 5% have

any insurance against sickness, including benefits of fraternal societies.

The average income of a workingman in British Columbia—and this probably is typical of Canada—is somewhat less than a thousand dollars a year. His average loss of time through sickness is about a week yearly. The average amount of his savings at any single time is about the equivalent of a week's wages; this is all that frequently separates him from destitution. His loss of time is apt to consume his reserve of cash, leaving him nothing with which to pay his bills unless he deprive himself and his family to do it. To a person in this category illness is a constant menace to prosperity and progress and may be a crushing disaster. The amount of sickness among the members of this class, its cost in medical and hospital bills and the time loss may be determined with a fair degree of accuracy. Much of this illness is preventable; responsibility for its existence must be shared by the industry in which the worker is employed and by the community in which he resides. The extent of this share of responsibility can be determined or, at least, estimated. What of the remedy?

The answer is "insurance". Insurance merely means that a group of people large enough to be evenly affected by the exceedingly accurate statistical laws of averages combine to meet the total loss of the group occasioned through any cause by contributing equal shares of this total. This is eminently successful in life insurance, fire, and other kinds of insurance, and there is no adequate reason for not applying the principle to the damage sustained through loss of health. But it must be compulsory. Only thus can it be applied fairly and effectually and at a reasonable cost. Similar principles underlie the operation of the Workmen's Compensation Acts of various provinces of Canada. These Acts have been a distinct success, operating with a minimum of friction, and to the general satisfaction of all interests involved. They are compulsory in

their application to all engaged in industry. This leads to ease of collection and cheapness of operation—in the case of British Columbia as low as four per cent. They involve the principle of contribution. The chief cost is paid by the industry since accident is regarded as a result, mainly, of conditions pertaining to industry. But the workman has to pay his share of the cost of medical aid. The scheme of the acts is comprehensive; medical aid is given, complete and unlimited; hospital and laboratory treatment is included, and a sufficient amount is charged to cover all costs. Compensation is paid for time lost, and the chief cause of worry and hardship is thus removed.

The workman, with certain reservations, may have any doctor he wishes. This is a most important feature of the scheme because in such circumstances a man naturally prefers the services of someone whom he knows and trusts and who will take a personal interest in his treatment to someone who has been chosen for him, be he ever so good. The reputation of the doctor, in turn, is at stake for he, naturally, wishes to retain his patients. Competition is healthy among doctors as it is in any other trade or profession.

Doctors are paid, not by capitation fee, but for the work actually performed. The fees are reasonable, and are based on the scale employed in their regular practice. This also is an excellent feature; it is the best way of paying for any professional work, and much the most satisfactory from the doctor's point of view. The "panel" system, whereby the doctor is paid "so much a head", is bad; at best it is a gamble and leads to poor work.

Our present system of employing and paying doctors, moreover, is one which our people understand and have followed for many generations. It is, too, the one preferred by the medical profession, which does not wish to become a branch of the civil service, but to be free to conduct its business in its own way. It is best in introducing any new scheme to retain,

as far as possible, what is good in the old methods, and not to disturb existing ways to a greater extent than is necessary. This is in accord with our Anglo-Saxon method of using the old bricks of custom, as long as they are sound, in the new buildings of progress, and it makes for orderly advancement, economy and simplicity.

This scheme of accident insurance may be regarded as one of our laboratory experiments and has, we may fairly say, been of great value in showing us the right line to follow. We have not yet, however, made any organized attempt in this country to devise a definite and coherent plan of health insurance. At present there is but a jumble of methods, official, semi-official, and voluntary: organizations, partly voluntary, partly salaried, for the control of tuberculosis, and other communicable disease; health units, operated with inadequate resources, and with little intelligent understanding by the public; travelling clinics in Saskatchewan, and other more or less sporadic experiments. Each of these does a certain amount of good work, but because of overlapping and waste of effort the results are not what might be obtained from an orderly and comprehensive method of dealing with the problem. Great Britain, Germany, and certain other countries have adopted methods of insurance, but they are hopelessly limited and are operated as cheaply as possible. There is reason to doubt that they would be applicable to this country. But, limited in scope as they are, the fact that they have included much preventive work has done great good, and they are being modified in the direction of greater completeness.

It is more than probable that the principles that have proved so successful and so acceptable in the operation of the Workmen's Compensation Act will be followed, with necessary modifications, in any Health Insurance Legislation that may be introduced in this country. There is a strong and growing demand for such legislation, particularly from organ-

ized labour. The good results of the Workmen's Compensation Acts are appearing in greater industrial peace, increased efficiency, less hardship, and, finally, in a definite reduction of accidents through the preventive work that is being done. There is, as far as one can tell, no serious ground for criticism of these Acts, and all concerned seem fairly well satisfied with them.

The application of their principles to the control of sickness should not be so very difficult—though there are some thorny problems. The cost of sickness is roughly three times that of accident. The allocation of cost would be differently arranged, but the principle would be the same. It may be suggested, then, that if any system of Health Insurance is introduced, it should be based on the following principles.

It should be compulsory on all whose earnings fall below a certain level, to be determined. Various levels are suggested, but this is outside the scope of our discussion.

It should be contributory. The assured should pay his share; the government, i.e. the community, and the industry each its share.

Families should be included. The omission of this feature is one of the deficiencies of the British Act. So much depends on this, in the matter of child welfare, of maternal mortality, and kindred diseases, that it is vital.

It should be complete; medical service, hospital service, laboratories, dental care, and nursing should all be included.

A complete and well considered system of preventive medicine is a most important part of any Health Insurance scheme. Infant clinics, pre-natal and post-natal clinics, school clinics, and visiting nurses would be essential parts of a complete system.

The patient should be guaranteed the free choice of a doctor who should be paid for work done on the basis of a fixed scale of fees. An ideal system would include also provision

for compensation for loss of time in the case of the wage-earner. It is doubtful, however, if its inclusion at first would be wise. It might make the initial cost unduly high; this feature might be deferred until the essential elements of the system had been placed in operation. It would also be necessary, at first at least, to exclude chronic and institutional diseases, as, for instance, tuberculosis, to avoid placing an undue burden on the system in its initial stage.

The Legislature of British Columbia at its 1929 session appointed a commission to study the whole question of Health Insurance and Maternity Benefits. It has recently brought in an interim report which states that there is a widespread demand for these benefits and urges their introduction mainly along the lines of the Workmen's Compensation Act. The commissioners have amassed a great deal of information on the subject and have asked for time to continue their study. Their next report is awaited with great interest. There is reason for believing that a measure designed on sane and tested lines, not too radical, but capable of modification and extension, would be of great value. Such a measure, distributing the burden equitably, would have the co-operation and support of all classes and would go far in mitigating the suffering and loss caused by illness.

CURRENT EVENTS

THE ASSIZE OF DEMOS.

A quietly harboured ambition on the part of the present Prime Minister to equal in tenure the record of his illustrious predecessor, whose mantle he assumed eleven years ago, and a frankly avowed eagerness on the part of the Conservatives to regain the reins of power which fell from a loose grip nearly nine years ago, give bright promise of a general election campaign this summer as keen as that of 1926 but more truly indicative of the central points of Canadian political and economic thought. While Sir John A. Macdonald's confession that he was really more interested in candidates than in policies continues to represent a considerable factor in electoral contests yet there is warrant for expecting that the approaching battle of the ballots will be fought and decided on the merits of the economic issue to a greater degree than has been the case for many years. Speculation as to the result of the polling is idle and gratuitous; suffice it to say that a common peril to both major parties lurks in this appeal to the people, namely, a repetition of the ugly conditions in parliament following the 1925 election when Progressivism won control of the House. To say that the electorate is indifferent or lethargic would be to utter a slander, more or less innocuous, but to secure anything approaching an adequate reflection of public thought it will require some lusty tub-thumping on the part of the campaigners due to the particular season of this appeal and to the determination of the enfranchised to retrieve by even more assiduous application to work the slump in their pocket-books caused by the general price collapse of recent months. Again, to provoke a wide clamour for change will be the aim of the Outs and to mollify that urge will be the task of the Ins.

That the fiscal question will be uppermost on the hustings is now apparent. It will be the third time in the history of Dominion politics that this has been the case. In 1878 the Mackenzie Government was overthrown by Sir John A. Macdonald in an election the principal, if not the sole, issue of which was the tariff. The Conservatives persuaded a majority of the electors that a protective tariff was essential to the welfare of a young country, that diversified industry was necessary for increased national wealth, and that a wider variety of industries could be achieved only through the imposition of high tariff duties. Another contest in which the tariff held first place was that of 1911 when Sir Wilfrid Laurier submitted to the people his proposal for reciprocal free trade with the United States in certain specified commodities. Either because of an almost inexplicable delay in dissolving parliament after the scheme had been prepared or because of what to many appeared to be its rather sweeping character, the reciprocity pact swept Sir Wilfrid out of office. Now, for a third time, a Liberal Ministry is asking the people to approve of a fiscal policy which notably represents a generous appropriation of the proposals of those who on two previous occasions defeated Liberal Governments. It is an odd circumstance, and how its oddity will affect the thought or touch the imagination of Canadians will obviously determine the result of the balloting.

In the realm of politics this anomalous circumstance is easily explained. A year ago when the third session of this sixteenth parliament was in progress the United States Congress began its work on a tariff measure designed to fulfil the promise of Mr. Hoover in the presidential campaign. How that structure extended far beyond its original design is a question solely for the Capitol and the White House to answer, but a year ago with the powerful opposition in the Senate yet to be disclosed there was a reasonable certainty that at least

two basic industries in Canada—agriculture and fisheries—would be hard hit by its provisions. This gave to the Conservatives a useful text for speeches in and out of Parliament, and their demand for retaliation, though they have carefully avoided use of that term, contained so much of plausibility that the Liberal Government, mindful of the effectiveness of the appeal against Sir Wilfrid Laurier, quickly decided that they could not ignore it.

It was patently futile to attempt anything by way of reprisal at that session of parliament simply because no finality had been reached at Washington, although the ground work for retaliatory legislation was then begun. The Tariff Board had held a considerable number of hearings on a wide variety of commodities which are imported, to a greater or less extent, from the United States. In particular, the Board had on at least two occasions given careful consideration to the public representations of the iron and steel industries, in their primary, secondary and tertiary aspects, and while those sittings had begun with no anticipation of how promptly and how drastically Congress was to obey the command of President Hoover, yet the final investigation into the requests and the needs of the iron and steel industry in Canada, as well as those of other industries, was given a definite direction by the Tariff Board at Ottawa so that the Government and Parliament might be accurately advised as to the most effective means of meeting the challenge of this country's largest single customer and nearest neighbour. As the creature of a Liberal Government and staffed by exceedingly astute economists the Tariff Board became a powerful factor in the situation arising out of the bill before Congress. As to its methods of operation and the transformation which it has actually accomplished in the treatment of tariffs more will be said later.

For the Liberals, with their traditional dislike of purely protective duties, the task of preparing retaliatory measures

against a neighboring nation was not altogether welcome but in politics, at least, absence of conviction and ineptitude do not necessarily co-exist. In other words, necessity is a prolific inventor. Three courses lay open to them. They could simply resort to a horizontal increase in the general tariff against the United States, or, at least, against commodities identical with or similar to those against which the United States raised its duties. They could stem the flow of goods from the United States by increasing the flow from the United Kingdom. They could do both. They chose the last course, but with one important modification. They granted a substantial increase in the British preference on a lengthy list of goods, but when it came to direct action against the United States they proposed a countervailing duty on a list of sixteen specific commodities.

Refusal of the Liberals to indulge in any horizontal increase in the general tariff against the United States will be one of the important issues before the electors. The Liberals will point out, quite properly, that to indulge in a horizontal increase in the tariff against the United States would be automatically and simultaneously to erect a similar barrier against other countries whose trade this country is anxious to preserve. (Despite the fact that Canada has trade treaties in force with over forty countries there remain, outside of any special commercial arrangements, a considerable number whose markets are valuable to the Dominion.) The Conservatives will with equal force point to the protective measures adopted in Australia where, they will contend, the economic situation is not more serious, not more emergent than in Canada, and already in Parliament they have expressed little preference between British and American competition. The Conservatives before the electors will demand higher protection for Canadian industry against the competition not only of the United States but also of the United Kingdom. The impatience of the Conservatives for the Liberals because the

latter opened the door more widely to the United Kingdom and locked with a key, instead of a bolt, the door against the United States has in it conceivably a slight taint of exasperation at the dexterity with which the Liberals have appropriated and modified the Conservative protection principle in the case of the United States. Mr. Bennett, in his Budget amendment this session, sought, in carefully qualified terms, to convict the Liberals of a theft of policy—he called it a breach of solemn pledges—but in the political code there does not appear any penalty provided for such a crime except, of course, when the effects of such crime appear to the people to be injurious. The extent to which the Liberals have again utilized good Conservative doctrine adds more point to a remark frequently heard from more or less dispassionate observers that there is to-day so little difference between the actual fiscal practices of Liberals and Conservatives that it is difficult to decide which way to vote. Also, there is much point to a remark of a Montreal Conservative member in the House recently that “we may advocate protection or free trade in the extreme, but as practical policies they do not now exist in this country.”

There is less of cynicism and more of unconscious hopefulness in the remark about the growing similarity in the fiscal policies of the two major political parties in Canada. For the Conservatives to contend that countervailing duties against the United States are only a half measure and after-the-fact preventive and that the only weapon for this country is a horizontal increase in the general tariff is to prescribe a major operation for a minor ailment, and, on the other hand, for Liberals to argue against higher protection to certain industries because it might jeopardize the foreign market for the products of Canada's farms and forests is to ignore an essential need of all countries in temperate zones, namely, diversified industry. Somewhere between lies the best policy for Canada and, in fact, the Minister of Finance in submitting his Budget

to parliament at the session just closed claimed for it a deliberate effort to meet the divergent, though not necessarily conflicting needs of a wide country. Here with the mention of a policy calculated to promote a closer unification of the commercial and industrial energies of the Dominion it should be emphasized that the leaders in both major parties have in their public utterances in the past three years made an exceedingly worth while contribution to the movement for enhancing the solidarity of a country upon which Nature has imposed some serious geographical handicaps. National unity has long since passed the by-word stage; it has become securely emplaced upon the minds and imaginations of the people, so securely that no electoral issue or contest, however it may provoke party bitterness, can disturb it.

The growing desire in the Canadian business world to avoid extremes and to foster the live-and-let-live spirit is reflected in the deliberations before the Tariff Board whose operations in the past three years have done much to free tariff matters from the shackles of political consideration. That they can never become entirely free with a system of parliamentary government is obvious, but it can be fairly said that some of the evils that formerly attended discussion of Canadian industries and the actual tariff needs of those industries have been removed.

During the earlier days when it was directed by Rt. Hon. George P. Graham and in its later stages under the chairmanship of William H. Moore the Tariff Board has actually dealt with practically every considerable industry and business in this country. Hundreds of Canadian business men have attended its hearings, about two hundred applications of wide variety have been considered, and at least two major tasks have been performed by the Board and to the expressed satisfaction of the industries concerned, namely, the revision two years ago of the cotton and woollen schedules and the revision

last fall of the iron and steel schedules. In each case a tremendous amount of technical work was entailed with careful re-wording of the definition columns, elimination of obsolete items, inclusion of items evolved out of the rapidly changing and enlarging needs of those industries and a thorough examination of the actual tariff requirements. In the scores of recommendations sent by the Board to the Government and thence to Parliament not all the applicants obtained all they desired, but there has been general agreement with the methods and manners of the Board. Because of a certain amount of mendicancy, as between some applicants and the framers, whoever they may be, a condition difficult to remedy so long as the human race is prone to err, it may never be possible to build a scientific tariff, but an approach has already been made, and the change in the nature of tariff discussion in Parliament, in committee of ways and means when individual items may be discussed on their merits, gives warrant to that assertion. Wrangles about revenue and protective tariffs are seldom, if ever, heard in committee but rather reasoned discussions on the specific needs under actual conditions of given industries. In other words, the tariff controversy has passed almost completely from the theoretical to the practical stage. Political oratory has given place to business talk, brass rails to brass tacks.

The emphasis placed by the Liberal Government upon its extension of the British preference must have an important bearing upon the deliberations of the Imperial Conference and the Imperial Economic Conference which will meet in London this fall. Actually, there are a number of items in the tariff proposals of the budget which were put there in response to specific requests from the present Government of the United Kingdom which has been compelled to seek wider markets within the Empire for its manufacturers. The central question to be decided at the London meetings will be the extent

to which the United Kingdom is prepared to go in reciprocal treatment. Canada has not yet overcome her amazement at the treatment accorded her wheat last winter and there is bound to be some plain speaking between the mother and the sons. Both Canada and the Dominions of the Antipodes will want to know where is the dividing line between Britain's consideration for such Latin countries as Argentina and her consideration for those who are constituent parts of the British Commonwealth. Whichever party in this country emerges victorious from the coming contest is bound to play a most influential part in the Imperial conclave.

While the paramount appeal in this election will be that of the tariff no contest has been free from certain local or sectional issues. The racial and religious conflict that marked the last provincial election in Saskatchewan may have its echo in the federal campaign, not only in that province but also in Quebec, for if cries against the French race and the Roman Catholic religion are quietly used in the Western province against Liberal candidates, the cry against the extreme elements of Protestantism is certain to be used against Conservative candidates in Quebec, and, in fact, has already been used. The most irreparable mischief that will be wrought by such tactics will, all sane Canadians hope, serve to furnish a final lesson to those who, by a hopeless lack of reasoning, imagine that any possible useful purpose can be promoted.

In both Premier King and Mr. Bennett the Canadian people have party leaders of outstanding equipment and whose energies are being completely devoted to efforts at solving national problems as vexing, as complicated as have confronted the wisest statesmanship of any land. In public speech and in private contact they hold an enviable place in the estimation of those by whom they are known, and to either of them the really onerous duties that devolve upon a Prime

Minister of this Dominion can be safely and confidently entrusted.

FREDERICK C. MEARS.

TARIFFS IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

With a tariff bill passing through its last parliamentary stages at Washington, and a far-flung revision of the Customs Tariff Act already effective at Ottawa, it is natural to ask what effect the U. S. Tariff bill, when it is finally enacted, will have upon the trade of Canada, and what will be the reaction to the Dunning budget upon the export trade of the United States. Both questions are timely, and to either there is, of course, an obvious reply. When two nations, no matter how amicable may be their protestations, pass legislation designed by each to decrease importations from the other, there are bound to be some commercial casualties, some business dislocation, some curtailment of trade. Hostile tariffs diminish trade, although their effect may be magnified.

The tariff is not the only factor in fixing the price of commodities. The element of transportation cost is often more important. For example, the milk and cream produced in some of the eastern counties of Ontario and in the Eastern Townships of Quebec enjoy a freight differential to the great consuming markets of New York and Boston against which the milk and cream producers of Iowa and Wisconsin can only contend by procuring an embargo-like tariff duty. This may or may not wrest the New York and Boston markets from the Canadian producers of milk and cream. But apart from the tariff and transportation charges, there are currents of commerce which produce situations most puzzling to the Protectionist. There is no apparent reason why the same sample of wheat should command a higher price in Manitoba or Saskatchewan than it does in North Dakota or Montana. One would

naturally think that the Canadian tariff duty would prevent the North Dakota or Montana farmer from selling any of his wheat in the prairie provinces. Yet in the fall of 1929 a very considerable quantity of North Dakota and Montana wheat was trucked across the international boundary line and sold at a considerable profit after paying the Canadian tariff duty of 12c. a bushel.

Nevertheless it is possible to make the tariff duty on some commodities so high as to constitute an embargo. In the case of the Tariff Bill apparently about to pass the Congress at Washington there are many duties against Canadian agricultural products which are frankly designed to be prohibitory. They are likely to inflict severe injuries upon the cattle growers and dairy men of the Dominion. It is these duties which have aroused a justifiable feeling of resentment. It may be well however to view the Bill as a whole and then take stock as best we can of its likely reaction upon Canadian production and Canadian export trade.

The bulk of the tariff schedules in this Bill are of slight interest to Canada. The chemical schedule, the schedules relating to sugar and molasses, to tobacco, to textiles of wool, cotton, jute, silk and rayon are certainly of no great interest. Generally speaking, manufacturing costs are as high in Canada as they are in the United States. The Canadian manufacturer may have cheaper power and possibly lower labour cost but his American competitor can effect far-flung economies in fabrication and distribution through the instrumentality of mass production. Were the United States to reduce or altogether abolish its tariff upon manufactured products the market thus thrown open would be largely engrossed by British, German and other oversea manufacturers. The exports of Canada to the United States are normally from the farms, the forests, the mines and the fisheries of the Dominion.

So far as the fisheries are concerned the changes in the

new Tariff Bill are more numerous than important. The United States must always import fully one-half of her supply of fresh-water fish from Canada and the tariff duty of 1c. a pound is merely a revenue duty. The duty on halibut and other sea fish brought into American ports by Canadian fishermen is defended upon the ground that the Canadian fishermen purchase their gearing and tackle in Canada at a lower price. The importation of halibut by American fishermen along the Pacific coast could be greatly curtailed by rescinding the Order-in-Council which permits these fishermen to land their catch at Prince Rupert and then ship it duty free through Canada to the United States. Probably the most important changes in the clauses of the Tariff Bill relating to fish are those which increase to 3c. a pound the import tax on fillets. The filletting of haddock and other sea fish has enormously increased the demand for fish and the facilities for its distribution. The Americans engaged in filletting fish at Boston claim that their competitors in Nova Scotia get a lower freight rate to interior points such as Omaha and St. Louis and they also claim that the mere fact that the Canadian fillets are "imported" gives them an adventitious value in the domestic market. The tariff changes in respect to fish, however, will have little or no effect upon United States importations from Canada.

Farm and dairy products are much more seriously affected. At the head of the list stands cattle. The cattle exported from Canada to the United States are yearlings which are purchased for finishing purposes. They relieve the Canadian growers of a surplus which apparently can find no other market. The trade is considerable, amounting last year to more than thirteen million dollars. It thrived in spite of the tariff duties imposed by the Tariff Act of 1922, which were two cents a pound on cattle weighing 1,050 pounds or more, and 1½ cents a pound upon cattle weighing less than 1,050

pounds. The young cattle sent over from Canada paid the lower duty. The Hawley-Smoot bill places a tariff on cattle weighing 700 pounds or more at 3 cents a pound, and upon cattle weighing less than 700 pounds $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. The cattle exported from Canada weigh more than 700 pounds, though probably less than 1000, and for all practical purposes the tax upon them has been increased 100 per cent.

The tariff on milk is increased to $6\frac{1}{2}$ c. a gallon and on cream to 56c. a gallon. These bid fair to be an embargo. Last year Canada exported milk to the United States valued at seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and cream valued at five million dollars. There is also a sharp increase in the duty on cheese; last year Canadian exports of cheese to the United States were valued at one million eight hundred thousand dollars. The tariff on maple sugar will be increased to 8c. a pound and it cannot but diminish the imports from Canada which last year amounted to nearly two and a half million dollars. Flaxseed under the Tariff Act of 1922 was subject to a duty of 40c. a bushel and imports from Canada for years ranged around the five million dollar mark. The new duty of 65c. per bushel must have a prejudicial effect although flaxseed from Argentina will be subject to the same duty and to much higher transportation cost to the chief market at Duluth. Potatoes are increased from 50c. to 75c. a hundred pounds. This is designed to be prohibitive. Potatoes from the Maritimes to the value of several million dollars a year came in under the old rate which it was thought at the time of its adoption would be prohibitive.

So far as the products of the forest, crude or processed, are concerned, the outlook is favourable. Logs and shingles are firmly anchored on the free list and at this writing the probabilities are that soft lumber will also be admitted free of duty. Pulpwood, woodpulp and newsprint paper remain on the free list and last year the United States imported from

Canada pulpwood valued at more than thirteen million dollars, woodpulp valued at more than thirty-six million dollars, and newsprint paper valued at more than one hundred and twenty-nine million dollars.

It is, of course, by no means certain that the cattle grower of Western Canada will discontinue exporting young cattle to the United States. If the price of cattle in the United States rises because of the duty the increased duty may be absorbed in the higher price. It is evident that if any tariff duty be 100% effective (increasing the domestic price to the extent of the tariff duty), then that duty is paid by the consumer and not by the exporter. If the tariff on wheat of 42c. a bushel caused wheat in the United States to sell for 42c. a bushel more than wheat in Canada it would afford the American wheat grower no protection. In that event it is true the Canadian grower would have to pay 42c. a bushel for the privilege of selling in the American market but if the price he got in the American market was 42c. a bushel more than he could obtain at home he would be nothing out of pocket. If the price of cream in Boston and of milk in New York be increased to the extent of the additional tariff duties Canadian milk and cream will continue to be imported without diminishing the net return to the Canadian producer. Stranger things have happened as the result of tariff legislation in the past.

Canadian exports to the United States will no doubt be diminished by the passage of the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill. It is unlikely that the framers of that bill were actuated by any ill-will toward Canada. The suggestion that the American farmer stood in dire need of higher protective duties upon agricultural products came first from President Hoover when he opened his campaign in August, 1928, as the Republican candidate for President. It was implemented by his summoning Congress in extra session within a month after his inaugu-

ration for the primary purpose of revising upward the agricultural schedule of the tariff law. There was a demand for a higher duty upon sugar from the sugar beet growers of the western and south-western states. There was a demand for higher duties against tropical fruits, which competed with the fruits grown in California, for higher duties against early fruits and vegetables which came into competition with the products of Florida. The demand for a higher duty upon cattle was directed against Mexico as well as Canada. In an effort, however, to revise upward the tariff duties upon farm products it was inevitable that the blow should fall heaviest upon Canadian producers who could easily export cattle, poultry, dairy products, and potatoes to the United States. This list would be much longer except for the fact that heavy burdens had already been laid upon all the other agricultural products of Canada by the Emergency Tariff Act of 1921 and the Fordney-McCumber Tariff Act of 1922. Yet when we consider the vast number of tariff increases carried in the Hawley-Smoot bill which affect nearly all the exporting countries of the world, it cannot be said that this legislation was especially directed against Canada.

This may in part explain why the Dunning budget has been received in the United States with nationwide consternation. There is no mistaking the purpose of the Canadian tariff revision or the popular feeling behind it. No one in the United States questions the propriety of Canada purchasing her supplies from the Mother Country and sister Dominions instead of from a foreign nation. The gradual development of such a policy has long been in progress and was to be anticipated. The reaction in Washington, however, is one of resentment toward the tariff bill now before Congress because it is firmly believed that except for that bill Canada would not have embarked at this time upon such an extensive revision of her fiscal policy.

It is the opinion in Washington that the Dunning budget delivers a telling blow in the most scientific manner. The crux of the budget is the iron and steel schedule. The countervailing duties on grains, meats and other products are mere window dressing by comparison. They really tender to American producers a fair offer of reciprocity, but it is the iron and steel duties which present a stern and rock-bound front. Ordinarily the shrewd exporter can drive a coach and four through a schedule of this kind because of faulty terminology and classifications. But the iron and steel schedule in the new Canadian tariff is considered by trained experts and officials of the United States to be the most up-to-date and scientific iron and steel schedule ever crystallized into legislation. It was not a slap-dash revision but evidently resulted from months of laborious investigation and exhaustive labour by the Dominion Advisory Board on Tariff and Taxation.

Personally I am inclined to doubt that these tariff changes will transfer from the United States to Great Britain Canadian trade amounting to two hundred million dollars per annum. As I have already said the tariff is only one factor in the commercial equation. The United States Department of Commerce, however, agrees with Mr. Dunning in saying that American export trade to that amount is menaced by the Canadian budget. Even though the loss be only one hundred million dollars per year it will be a high price to pay for the privilege of keeping out of the country a few head of cattle and a few gallons of milk. Fortunately the shot will have to be paid by men who can well afford it, the great iron masters and steel kings of the United States. It is their greed for higher and ever higher protection which has gotten the United States into the present tariff mess.

Whatever may be the reaction of the Dunning budget upon the iron and steel business and related industries, I do not believe it has aroused any feelings of resentment against

Canada among the people of the United States. They have been groaning for years under an almost intolerable system of tariff taxation. For reasons which are obvious to many but which it would take a long time to explain they have been utterly unable to relieve themselves of this burden or to prevent its growing heavier with the incoming of every administration. Their only hope has been that some foreign nation would pound into the head of Uncle Sam, who is by way of being of a rather stubborn and cantankerous disposition, the fundamental economic fact that no country can always sell but never buy in the markets of the world. Canada has apparently undertaken this task and millions of people in this country are wishing her God-speed. I do not look for any "tariff war" or any bad feeling between the two great nations which dominate so large a portion of North America. Some Canadian producers may suffer from the United States tariff bill about to be enacted but their losses may be less than they now anticipate. Some United States manufacturers and exporters will find their trade with Canada cramped by the Dunning budget. They will be largely themselves to blame and will receive scant sympathy from their fellow-citizens. I have no doubt these fellow-citizens will come in great droves this summer to enjoy the Canadian climate, the Canadian bacon and anything else which may be obtainable. The Canadian visitor coming to the United States need not ring the bell softly; he will find no crepe on the door. Canadians in the United States at the present time are feeling exceedingly well, they are prouder than ever of Canada.

TOM KING.

BOOK REVIEWS

Thucydides and the Science of History. By Charles Norris Cochrane, University College, Toronto. Oxford University Press, 1929.

Professor Cochrane's book should be a useful antidote to modern criticism of Thucydides. Especially will it help to lay the ghost of Cornford's *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, with his weird show of puppet men dancing on strings pulled by Fate and Chance, regardless (so it is alleged) of the forces that ruled the actual world of Trade Policy and Big Business in Corinth and the Piraeus. The contention that Thucydides is pre-eminently a clear-sighted scientific historian is ably argued, and illustrated with a wealth of examples that leaves little to be said on the main point by others.

The treatise is an elaboration of Littré's dictum, reproduced by Forbes, that Thucydides in style and mind is closely akin to Hippocrates. Such an idea was worth exploiting, if only because Hippocrates is the one prose writer, contemporary or predecessor, whose work has survived in bulk, excepting Herodotus, with whom Thucydides has been endlessly compared and contrasted. If it can be shown that in his attitude to human affairs in general, the subject-matter of history, Thucydides is governed by the same principles that guided Hippocrates in dealing with human health and disease we have fresh light on the obscure question of the 'enlightenment' that produced all three, and much else in the age of Pericles. Anaxagoras and the rest are little more than illustrious names; but the Father of Scientific History was a contemporary of the Father of Scientific Medicine; they were perhaps personal friends of Democritus, and of one another; and may have been thrown together when living in the vicinity of Thasos, close by the philosopher's native town. And just as Hippocrates, in

harmony with the views of Democritus, struck out a method adequate to the demands of true medical and biological science, so, according to Mr. Cochrane, do the histories of Thucydides represent an attempt to apply these methods to the study of social life, an attempt which furnishes "an exact parallel to the attempts of modern scientific historians to apply evolutionary canons of interpretation derived from Darwinian science."

A comparison between the writings of the Hippocratic *corpus* and Thucydides confirms the thesis thus outlined. Both in theory and in language a measure of identity is unmistakable; the theory in either work being a thorough-going rational empiricism, and the technical terms employed revealing a common origin in the same school of thought. For example, the peculiar use in both authors of the word *prophasis* is striking. Indeed the Thucydidean *prophasis* was a standing puzzle, inexplicable until it was realized that the term is used in a specialized sense, precisely as employed by his medical confrère. That commentators need no longer stumble over this word in Thucydides may seem a small gain; but as it is the key-word in a crucial passage dealing with the true motives as distinguished from the alleged grounds of the war, its elucidation is a welcome advance. Having made out a significant identity in language as well as in point of view between the father of medical science and our historian, Mr. Cochrane proceeds to argue that both in the collection of facts and in their interpretation Thucydides adheres closely to his scientific principles, and as a result occupies by right a commanding position in his chosen style of historiography.

In the resumé which occupies most of the treatise many of the controversial issues raised by commentators are touched upon, with interesting conclusions. The scope of this analysis may be inferred from the chapter headings—The State, Interstate Relations, The Problem of Government, War and Revolution—titles which indicate that Thucydides dealt with his

proper theme, the downfall of the Athenian Empire, in no narrow or superficial fashion. Obviously any serious discussion of these topics, designed to throw into relief the historian's scientific treatment of them, must be distinctly academic, and the student will not look for easy reading. Yet the argument might have run more smoothly if the main contention had been a little less laboured, and if we had been spared the extremely sharp opposition set up between Thucydides and a number of others, including Herodotus and Plato. It is disconcerting to find Herodotus disparaged as a 'philosophical' historian, and rated on that ground below the scientific Thucydides when as a philosopher Thucydides is much the more adequate of the two. Needless difficulty also is caused, in trying to define the historian's ultimate 'postulate', by rejecting the ordinary meaning of 'physical'—'the world with mind left out'—and certainly "physical determinism" does not readily suggest what we require. In general however the reasoning is close, and there is an abundance of penetrating comment rarely found in a treatise on this scale. As to style, it is fresh and vigorous and fully adequate to the excellent subject matter; and the sprinkling of technical terms like semeiology and prognosis is not excessive. There is a pleasing scarcity of expressions like 'environmental world'; and the only noteworthy misspelling is Laistregones.

That Thucydides did not live to finish his history is an incalculable loss. The last seven tragic years of the war are a blank, and there is no epilogue, no considered answer to the inevitable question—how far did the Athenian democracy justify itself at home and abroad in the face of utter and irretrievable disaster? Still, Thucydides does not leave us entirely in the dark as to his conclusions. Up to a point he is a Periclean democrat. He considered that democracy was workable, so long as the aristocratic principle, incarnate in Pericles himself, was in control. *Per se*, however, the constitution was not in his

eyes perfect: the moderate democracy of 411 was, he considered, superior. So that, while he would have disputed the fashionable later view that Pericles made the Athenians lazy, greedy and litigious, he would not have differed so widely from the position taken by the philosophers. The divergent views of Thucydides and Plato, for example, should not be exaggerated by adding the *Laws* as evidence. The pessimism of Plato's last years must be discounted; and we may ask whether Thucydides had he placed on record his judgment on the demos after the affair of Socrates would have dissented very strongly from the analysis of democracy offered by Plato in the *Republic*. As a practical man and a scientist Thucydides seems to have approved of democracy as the proper form of government for a community composed of such citizens as Pericles portrayed in his Funeral Oration. But the real Athenian, he was well aware, fell far short of that ideal: hence civil strife and national defeat, disillusionment and ruin. That Athenian democracy in the fifth century lived on such a high plane, and achieved so much, is proof that there was exceptionally fine stuff in the Athenian people; but we must add Thucydides to the number of those who hold that the democratic impulse which exalted Pericles to the exclusion of the peacemaker and ablest general, Cimon, degenerated with over-indulgence and developed a breed of extremists who by domestic faction and foreign aggression hastened the collapse of Athenian power—legacy of a short-lived union of hearts—and ensured the final disintegration of Greece, and her enslavement.

T. C.

* * * * *

Continental Statesmen. By George Glasgow, Foreign Editor of the *Contemporary Review*. Geoffrey Bles, London, pp. 238, 10s.

It is not possible, in a short space, to give an adequate

review of a book that covers so much ground and deals with such a variety of subjects. Few of us, however much we may have been interested in post-war movements, have the first hand knowledge which is necessary to the formation of authoritative judgments. A superficial examination is sufficient to reveal the fact that it is an important, complicated subject handled in an interesting fashion. About seventy prominent men of fifteen different countries appear in these pages; some, as Briand and Mussolini, demand several pages, while others, as M. Finely, the French banker, and Dr. Breitscheid, one of the promising younger Germans, must be content with a page or paragraph. A number of British statesmen appear, but only incidentally as they are connected with the policies and intrigues of the Continental statesmen. Take this statement, for example: "Count Volpi, in short, gave us a neat illustration of the way in which Continental statesmen 'pull the leg' of British statesmen. Mr. Churchill is an adroit politician, well alive to all the tricks as far as Westminster is concerned; but hopelessly at sea in a trial of wits with the slim practitioners of continental diplomacy. The only three British politicians who have successfully weathered continental guile since the war are Mr. Lloyd George, Lord Curzon and Mr. Bonar Law" (p. 95). There are ten "cartoons and caricatures" five of which, by H. R. Westwood, have been taken from the *Review of Reviews*.

The author places at the beginning, giving it a page to itself, this passage from a speech of Mr. Stanley Baldwin, July 26th, 1929: "If disaster comes, if bloodshed comes, as it often has in our history, the politicians always escape. The worst that can happen to the politician is loss of office; and the men who give their blood are generally those who have had nothing to do with the laying of the train that led to the explosion." This book is largely of the nature of a sermon on that text. In the chapter on Greece (p. 168) we have a grim

comment on this, a reminder that, under the pressure of tragic circumstances, there may be exceptions. "Six Cabinet Ministers were executed in Athens on the ground, established by courts-martial and coordinated with the accepted ethics of capital punishment, that the Greek offensive of 1922 in Asia Minor had been deliberately ordered by those politicians in the teeth of their own military advisers. Thousands of Greek boys had been killed, and thousands of Greek families had been bereaved, for purposes of party politics in Athens." Lord Curzon broke off diplomatic relations but soon, to his honour, realized that he had made a mistake. "The politicians at Lausanne were proud enough on second thoughts to realize that to wince because politicians as opposed to other people had been shot was to invite an obvious comment."

While this is the general tone we are not surprised that Mr. Glasgow (Chap. XII) congratulates Sweden on having learned how to keep the politicians in their proper place. "Swedish politics are seldom heard of: and therefore is symbolized their healthiness. Sweden may be taken as the model of what a political community ought to be. The politicians are unimportant in the life of the country, which is free from the harm done to trade, finance and all enterprises dependent upon them by the unsettling consequence of the politicians. In Sweden the politicians are kept in their place. They do what is necessary and do it well, and for the rest they lie low." Sweden, however, is a small country, it was not dragged into the war. We are told that the women's vote has tended to quieten it, and the removal of the Russian capital to Moscow has lessened anxiety from that direction. The case of Jugoslavia stands at the other extreme; as one of the new national creations it seems so far to be a failure. When the legislators began to use revolvers King Alexander proclaimed a dictatorship and suppressed the political parties. "Would that some omnipotence could suppress the whole body of European

politics for a season!" Yet Mr. Glasgow asks who would like to live in Italy under the present régime and notes sharply the absurdities of despotic rule in the case of General Primo de Rivera. One could not expect the Poles to learn statesmanship and political justice in a few minutes but the story of the annexation of Vilna, both the fact and the manner of it, is particularly unpleasant. It has embittered the relations of the two countries for ten years; Mr. Glasgow blames French influence and the weakness of Geneva. "But the controversy has waxed strong ever since, and by a just Nemesis Geneva has never been and probably never will be rid of it" (p. 199).

It is a relief to turn to the New Republic of Czechoslovakia and the wonderful work of Dr. J. G. Masaryk, the first President, a scholar and statesman of the first rank. It is the story of a remarkable man who dedicated his life to a great purpose and achieved considerable success. A tribute is paid to one of his lieutenants, Dr. Benes, who "is a serious person," "a striking exception to the general tendency of politicians." Mr. Glasgow defends him against English critics who found him too subservient to France.

It will be seen, from these extracts, that this is an important book for the student of politics written by a man who is a specialist in this line and who has had personal intercourse with many of the leading actors in these events. He pays a fine tribute to the late Herr Stresemann and to others who like him have laboured to restore their country and to encourage peaceful ideals. Though he regards it as absolutely necessary to the welfare of Europe he does not find the same spirit in France, Russia with its strange mixture of tragedy and comedy is an uncertain and unsolved problem.

For the general reader probably the most interesting pages are those on Briand, Veniselos and Mussolini. Naturally he has more sympathy with the Frenchman and the Greek than with the Italian. "Mr. Briand is an agreeable figure in

European affairs. He has done many things which the world has cause to be grateful for, and has probably on the whole been as pacifist in motive and in effect as any contemporary statesman" (p. 15). The changeful career and brilliant personality cannot be compressed into a few words. In the meantime Mussolini holds his own. Mr. Glasgow discovers one man, Count Volpi, "the only Italian of any repute who has avoided the two extremes of leaving Italy or becoming a pawn of Mussolini." For other men of independent spirit the alternative has been exile or silence. What is to come out of such a peculiar form of despotism, of extreme socialism? Who can tell? Not Mr. Glasgow, nor anyone else, with any certainty.

W. G. J.

* * * * *

God, being an introduction to the science of metabiology. By John Middleton Murry. Jonathan Cape. 10/6.

This is a painful book to review. It is written, as has been generally recognized, with a great sincerity; it contains matter of real importance, and it is worthy of that respect due to any book in which a man of culture and ability sets forth what he makes of this strange world of ours. Yet, unless one be a disciple of Mr. Murry, which will be given to few, it is difficult to write a review that shall not be satirical; for the book is entitled "God"; yet it begins with a long autobiographical section, at the close of which Mr. Murry cheerfully but politely says farewell to God of whom he confesses himself "a little tired"; the rest of the book reverts to the subject of Mr. Murry, a long quasi-philosophical disquisition, at the close of which many readers will be more than a little tired of the absence of God whose name is happily perpetuated in the title. If Mr. Murry, who has thought much and suffered much, could have been content to tell us quietly what in his view it all comes to in the end, he might have relied upon a sympathetic audience,

but the book is prophetic in avowed intention and needlessly contemptuous of many who are both learned, wise and patient. Mr. Murry offers us a 'reconciliation' between science and religion; this reconciliation is so complete, he tells us, that neither scientists nor theologians will perhaps be able to like it, "in which case I should conclude that neither of them really wants it."

Mr. Murry compels us to ask what are his qualifications for the great task which he has set himself. He seems to a layman in science to have that sort of general acquaintance with modern biology which may be reasonably expected of a layman; he is interested in psychology but has little respect for its professors; "the background of modern psychiatry," he tells us, "is chaos. One of our incident aims is to offer it a coherent one (*sic*). If it does not recognize the need, so much the worse for it." The most urgent task of psychology is "to understand what religion is," and then (God save the mark!) "to establish firmly its own genuine equivalents for the conceptions and entities of religion." His excursions into history in the form of anthropology and New Testament criticism are not wholly felicitous, because Mr. Murry hardly recognizes to how great an extent his supposed deductions are really his *à priori* assumptions. Furthermore it is a pity that one who would reconcile science with religion should appear to identify religion with Christianity and to dismiss all varieties of Christianity except the Roman Catholic (presumably the present Roman Catholic) as unworthy of serious consideration. If Mr. Murry were better acquainted with religious philosophy since the *Aufklärung* and with the story of mysticism in the East, his book might have been more valuable or possibly unwritten. But all this seems ungenerous, because Mr. Murry makes no claim to omniscience and is a man of remarkably wide reading, and unfair because he bases his convictions not upon a synthesis of knowledge but upon an intuitive or mystic

apprehension which he has attempted to work out in systematic form.

Mr. Murry's thesis may be set forth briefly. The mystical experience with which he himself started is "an immediate experience of an all-pervading Unity. If this all-pervading Unity is called God, then it follows necessarily that the experiencing subject knows himself as consubstantial with God." The mystic experiences himself as actual unity and experiences "a unity between that unity and the Universe." The implications are worked out thus: "in the Christian system, Jesus is God, the object of the mystical experience is God, and all values are God. God is the medium where they meet and merge. In this system (Mr. Murry's) the reality of organic evolution is the medium. Jesus is a supremely significant variation—a new man; the object of mystical experience is the underlying unity of biological life; and the values of all kinds are organic variations which maintain themselves." This new system is worked out with patience and care, but it is disappointing because its author has not satisfactorily considered certain quite fundamental questions. For instance, it is not plain whether Mr. Murry regards the ultimate reality as personal or impersonal; he uses such phrases as "the self-awareness of the one all-comprehending subject", "the unknown life of which we are the momentary vehicles", language of the Hegelian type which is religious rather than naturalistic; but in fact Mr. Murry thinks he has shown the idea of God to be completely otiose and has transposed religion "into the key of a pure and complete naturalism." There is a fundamental hesitancy or even inconsistency here.

Again, Mr. Murry has much to say about "values", a convenient phrase he has taken from modern philosophy, but he has not seen that the fundamental mystical intuition from which he sets forth can never lead on to any philosophy of values; for the mystical experience, as he tells us, is "a lapse

into the immediate self-experience of undifferentiated biological unity." The Vedantist is logical when he maintains that the mystical experience involves a denial of all value in the world which with all its gaily variegated colour is but *maya* or illusion. Then, when Mr. Murry defines values by saying that they "belong to a class of absolutely objective phenomena, namely, to the class of variations in the evolutionary process which maintain themselves," he identifies value with the attribute of relative permanence and thereby empties the idea of almost all its significance for philosophy. His definition of value is inconsistent with his real use of the idea, for he certainly, if inconsistently, finds values in the Universe which are to be judged as higher and lower, more or less true, and not merely more or less permanent.

Again, he speaks of the mystical experience as presenting man with "an immediate apprehension of reality" and as providing a "knowledge" which is totally distinct from "intellectual" knowledge. This mystical knowledge is a knowledge of what? What is its content? It is clearly a knowledge of man's unity with cabbages and typewriters and cigarettes and everything else in the Universe; it is the apprehension of the Universe as a whole or rather of the unity of all things underlying the differentiations of the world. In fact the mystical experience is a state of almost blank feeling with the minimum possible of intellectual content. Mr. Murry is most frank about this, for he tells us more than once that the mystical experience in itself and apart from its antecedents and consequents is not to be distinguished from his experience under an anaesthetic. The first effect of an anaesthetic is to deaden the higher spheres of consciousness, that is, the more distinctively human elements; the soul (if the term may be allowed) thus deadened receives the supreme illumination as to the meaning of the Universe and is given the hint which leads to the "science of metabiology." The truth is that the jumble of science and

metaphysics which is Mr. Murry's theory does not and could not arise from the mystical experience which in so far as it is complete is a state of undifferentiated feeling divorced from all critical judgment.

The value of the book, which is great, does not lie in its "metabiology" but in its autobiography. Nowhere else in literature to my knowledge can we find so clear and objective an account of the typical "mystical" experience in itself, in its antecedents and in its results written by one who himself has passed through that experience. Mr. Murry is quite right in maintaining that his experience is not unique and in feeling an affinity with Meister Eckhart; he is quite certainly wrong in supposing that Jesus was a mystic of this type. The real home of mysticism of this type is India. Hindu and Buddhist mysticism prove sufficiently that the mystical experience does not imply the existence of God, in other words, that it has no necessary connection with religion; but Hindu and Buddhist mystics have been logical, where Mr. Murry has not, for they have seen that the mystical experience robs the world of all value or significance.

In the mystical experience," says Mr. Murry, "the God-defenders of to-day dig their last trench; before the mystical experience the scientific 'naturalists' capitulate." It is not clear why the scientific 'naturalists', who are generally stout enough of heart, should throw up the sponge at this point, but Mr. Murry will apparently be surprised to learn that his book will be valued by religious people precisely because it shows so clearly that the type of mysticism which he propounds has nothing to do with religion, except in so far as mystics have thought that their state of ecstasy was an absorption in God. If he would reconcile science and religion, he would do well to acquaint himself more closely with what thinking men to-day mean by religion.

N. M.

The Hasting Day. George Herbert Clarke. Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd.

Professor Clarke is widely known as a critic and as one who truly appreciates poetry, and now he must take that place with the poets to which his book *The Hasting Day* entitles him. Those who have derived real pleasure from the introductions and notes to his *Selected Poems of Browning* and *Selected Poems of Shelley* know that he is a sound critic with a knowledge and natural taste that lead him to the greatest and best, and one can feel that guiding spirit in this collection of his poems—for it is a winnowed collection and one can imagine that there were rejections, with severe self-criticism, before the content of the book was finally fixed. As a result we have a book which one could not further diminish without loss. It is a most difficult task to find proper sequence for a set of poems of such varied interest. With an inveterate and, no doubt, deplorable habit, in disregard of the author's sequence, I began it at the end and found the two delightful poems of Child Life with such satisfaction that I recalled Francis Thompson's words, "Look for me in the Nurseries of Heaven." Poems for children are negligible unless they are babbled by the lips of loved ones or repeated for their ears, but poems about children may be wistful with all memories and may be surcharged with experience and still remain pure and innocent. Two such poems are *God's Eyes* and *A Small Boy Prays*. And if to these perfect little gems of feeling you add the poems about dogs which are also full of feeling you will be in touch with a source of one charm in Professor Clarke's book. The threnody on his dog's death goes wide and deep. The bond between a dog and his master can only be apprehended; there is no true understanding, it is all of imagination. With discretion and delicacy the poet tells us so, but he allows the master to carry on the deception with a touch of hope—

The love I bear thee,
My little dead comrade,
Forever is trying
To tell me something.

I am learning to listen.

The touching poems on death, the death of youth with its promise of loveliness unfulfilled, must be remarked upon; they give a repeated note of sadness and one might fancy they were rooted in experience. That leads me to say that the human interest is strong in this book; if we add the poems with a philosophical cast and the epigrams to the purely human poems, no doubt this is the strongest influence. But Beauty is sure of her claim in the nature poems and poems of places. Some of these lyrics of few lines are lovely in their movement. Let me quote *A Shore Sunrise*:

In the long low haze of the lost horizon,
Dim and dun,
The sea and the sun and the sky together
Are as one—
So still and secret the sky and the sea there,
And the sun!
Slowly, slowly the dawning waters
Lift as they list,
Slowly the breath of the sea floats upward,
And that pale mist,
Swimming and sifting through the sun's fingers,
Gleams amethyst.

Professor Clarke's sonnets are well wrought; one is tired of this hackneyed form, but I read several of these sonnets with a renewal of interest in the form and an acknowledgment that the possibilities are still there, if a master takes hold of it. *Over Salève, Lines Written in Surrey, The Wanderer's England*—I should like to quote all three, but I must be content with the last, which seems to me to meet the sonnet-requirements perfectly:

Where the gulls chide by the tidal cove lies home,
Where the meadow meets the cliff, the cliff the sea;
Cool-greening grass and old tranquillity
Breed dream-content. Not so the flooding foam
Of giant breakers climbing still, that come
And boom upon the beach, eternally,
Mightily dying, yet again to be—
The selfsame seas Ragnar was wont to roam!

Ah, that is England! They that drink her breast
 Drink a stern sweetness,—pain and secret peace;
In thoughts of her they find their dearest rest,
 Though restless they adventure without cease.
Her ancient rainbow is their anadem,
And the salt strength that girds her girdeth them.

Professor Clarke's poems are to be valued on account of their sincerity and their competent workmanship. These days are restless and experimental; new methods of expression are welcome, they must have their chance and their hour, but there will always be room for those poets who side with Ben Jonson: "It is the disease of the unskilful to think rude things greater than polished." Such poets, who may be thought reactionary by those in the rush for novelty, maintain the life of poetry; they carry on the tradition, and tradition in art is one of its vital factors, able to withstand a great deal of rough treatment. Professor Clarke's book does not shock us with any audacity of theme or novelty of form, but relies upon the tradition, which he carries on and uses with skill to express what he feels about life and nature.

D. C. SCOTT.

.
Golden Treasury of Famous Books. By Marjory Willison.
Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada. 1929.
Pp. xvi, 264.

Seven years ago Lady Willison, then Miss Marjory MacMurchy, published *The Child's House*. In happy fashion and with delicate insight it follows the growth of little Vanessa Brown's mental and emotional life between the ages of eight and thirteen. It has won much critical praise and is a permanent contribution, in its special *genre*, to Canadian literature. In the present volume we can feel the same sincere, sensitive pen at work, in the desire to provide boys and girls with well-considered guidance in their choice and use of books. The volume is composed of eight parts, the first of which deals with that prime favourite of children, Dickens, and with Scott.

Shakespeare and the Bible. Part II includes hints and helps in the reading of romance and adventure. Part III looks at myths and marvels and heroic deeds as told in song and story. Part IV discusses ballads, lays and narrative verse. Part V groups some great imaginers, both poets and prosemen. Part VI has to do with books on history and biography, politics and travel. Part VII chats with the child about letters, essays, diaries, etc. In the last part something of the wonder and enchantment of poetry is revealed.

It is no slight task to prepare such a book as this with discriminating taste, with constant sympathy for the child's point of view, and in a companionable style. The author has succeeded so well that the book should quickly commend itself to Canadian juvenile and home life. Every little while some especially illuminating word appears, as in the following instances: "No one should read all the time, for people are more important than books." "A poet sometimes is great for the people of his own generation, but the ages that follow may not care for his work. Yet it may be that after a hundred years or so, people will love the poet's work again." "Human beings are so wonderfully and strangely made that no mortal, no matter how hard he tries, can ever draw a perfectly true or a perfectly just picture of anyone."

The Afterword rectifies some occasional omissions, as in the case of James and De Morgan. We would add two or three names to the list of greater English poets on page 230, several names to the list of American writers on page 245, and *Quentin Durward* to the list of the chief Waverly Novels. The purely Canadian references are pleasing. We congratulate Lady Willison on her understanding loyalty to the fairy tale, despite sundry contemporary attacks on its value. Her book does not profess to be a complete guide (we should have to go far to find that), but it is a remarkably full, able and well-informed one.

G. H. C.

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY

SUMMER, 1930

INDIA AND THE SIMON REPORT

BY J. L. MORISON

TO attempt, in haste, a systematic examination of Sir John Simon's Report is impossible. All I can do is to examine a few of his main propositions in the light of impressions left in my mind by a visit, last winter, to India.

The earliest and most abiding of these is the feeling that for a great mass of the Indian population life is and will continue to be a desperate struggle for existence. The extreme poverty of the average cultivator, the uncertainty of the rainfall and therefore of the harvest, rumours of flights of locusts and other pests, the dependence of great stretches of the country on irrigation honestly administered, the onset of diseases so much more incalculable and disastrous than at home, these and a score of other more or less uncontrollable agents leave the inhabitants of rural India at the mercy of circumstances. The primary duty of government is to stand between a defenceless population and the scourges of nature. Opinion matters little; honest administration means every-

thing. A break-down in the efficiency and honesty of government will spell catastrophe on the largest scale. So, while Congress leaders talk lightly of chaos and bloodshed, having been guarded from such things by the British government until they no longer know what they mean, the agents of that government and the Simon commissioners, knowing that a strong and benevolent government is the Indian peasant's best friend, are slow to weaken the central authority. One hears the cry that, even if it means a decline in efficiency. "self-government is better than good government." The proposition is at best a doubtful one; and, in India, the final test of its value must be the welfare, not of the *Intelligentsia* of the cities, nor of British industrialists, but of the average poor Indian. That consideration is the main justification of British caution in making experiments.

At the other extreme of my impressions stands that of the general prevalence of the demand for self-government, rising, as at the Lahore Congress last Christmas, to an organized and fighting movement for independence. It is useless to minimize this fact. As I visited the colleges it was apparent that the majority of the students, some no doubt captured by influences at one remove Bolshevik, were in opposition to the *status quo*; many of them shouted cheerfully for revolution; and an immediate and complete measure of self-government was the best that they seemed to conceive possible. In the cities the vocal part took the same view. At the Congress—I was at Lahore during its meetings—the attitude of a majority of its members was one of fierce antagonism to Great Britain, and, in spite of Mr. Gandhi's controlling influence, nearly half the members were prepared to condone the senseless attempt to bomb the Viceroy's train. It is often said that the majority of the people of India are outside the separatist movement; but they are extremely accessible to the appeal of the Congress propaganda. When that propaganda is prepared

to disregard the ordinary standards of truth and the propagandists willing to involve the illiterate masses in chaos if only they can score their points against Great Britain, it is plain that the extreme *swaraj* party can always count on a certain kind of popular support.

Never before have I felt so baffled as last winter in India when I tried to relate the more extreme views to the hard realities of Indian life. For one thing it was clear that the Congress leaders had refused to face the task of reconciling the great religious divisions in India, except in so far as they might capture some elements of support for their struggle against England. Even the Sikh community, in December and January, spoke with uncertain voice, and, in spite of a few discredited adherents from the Muslim population, the Congress had to carry on without the solid body of Muhammadans who rightly suspected an attempt to impose on India a Hindu autocracy. If the coming reforms are really to be in the interests of the people of India, where is the sense in a movement whose first consequence must be a terrific civil war, with religion as its motive? I am prepared to prophesy that even if, in the coming year, the Hindu politicians induce the Muhammadans to join them in coercing the British government, the natural result must be a civil war which at one stroke will cancel the advance in civilization achieved through the last century.

It was further clear to me that the party of independence had refused to face "the frontier question." I spent some time round Rawalpindi and Peshawar, travelling through the Khyber pass, and saw Kohat, Bannu and Quetta. To an extraordinary degree peace and order were prevalent everywhere, and visits to C. M. S. hospitals enabled me to see some of the self-sacrifice and philanthropy which helped to make that peace something better than merely enforced order. It is characteristic of the Independence movement that, since

January, although the interests of *Indian* India require a quiet and controlled frontier, and although, if trouble should arise, the first victims would be the Hindus, traders, planters and the like, who do their work under the protection of the British border peace, attempts, temporarily successful, have been made to disturb the frontier. These frontier peoples, on our side of the line as well as in independent territory, are, as merely physical and fighting beings, astonishingly better than the population to the South and East. They are all Muslim in religion, and they can organize themselves for fight with a speed and efficiency with which an unguarded Hindu Indian could not cope. If the present frontier force were withdrawn, within a twelve-month the frontier tribes and the Muham-madans of the Punjab could establish without difficulty a new Northern Indian state, and I do not think that its South-eastern limit would come short of Delhi itself.

Another most baffling fact was the complete disregard exhibited by the separatists towards the offers of Lord Irwin and the Secretary of State for India. I have been immensely impressed with the sincerity and openmindedness of the vice-roy, and the extremely generous intentions of Mr. Benn and the responsible members of the British government. It is useless for Indian politicians to continue to fling charges of ill-faith against us. Lord Irwin and Mr. Benn mean much more than they say, and cherish as benevolent intentions towards India as any of the Indian leaders. By his now famous declaration, Lord Irwin obviously meant that, judging solely by the test of Indian welfare, England would give that amount of self-government to India which Indian politicians could work without bringing disaster to their country, and would continue to concede until the self-governing machine had been perfected. The slightest knowledge of what happened in Canada, where the problem was far less risky and contained far fewer possibilities of disaster, than in India,

ought to have convinced the separatists that Lord Irwin was indicating the one sane way in which India could come into her own. I argued at Lahore with my extremist friends, and pointed out that if they cared to use the quick intelligence which they possess, in furthering the operation of a partial scheme of self-government, within ten or fifteen years they would by peaceful means have come into possession of all they ever asked for; and that, if they desired separation, the final consequence of that dominion status towards which Britain proposed to help them was, as indeed it is with Canada to-day, the power to vote themselves in or out of the Empire as seemed best for Indian interests.

One can imagine a fierce call to battle where an alien and unbending autocracy has set its face resolutely against concession. But what is to be said when, without attempting to secure India against external and border attacks, or certain internal strife, Mr. Gandhi and the Congress fling aside an offer which must gradually, but not slowly, develop into all that could be asked, and which, if they so desired, would even permit them ultimately to separate without paying the appalling penalties which must attend any effort to force that issue into immediate operation?

None of us, except the ignorant and fanatic, are at present clear as to the exact lines of future development, but in the Simon Report both England and India have before them a masterly analysis of the actual situation, and definite proposals on which to work whether by amplification or modification. As the Report says, "A constitution is something more than a generalization: it has to present a constructive scheme," and in spite of all the rival war cries there is at present no other project before us which honestly faces all the facts.

The essence of the Simon scheme is *federation based on provincial self-government*. So far as federation is concerned, the existence of semi-independent native states, the wide dif-

ferences in race, mode of living, and climatic conditions, dividing province from province, and the extreme difficulty of governing a subcontinent with a population of 320 millions by a purely 'unitarian' administration, all suggests that federalism it must be. Similarly, since the provincial centres have already started towards responsible government, not even the very modified kind of success at present achieved by responsible Indian ministers in such departments as education should make us halt in extending the region of responsibility. Short of the danger of a collapse of essential services, we shall probably accept in more or less degree the Indian call for "self-government even if it is inefficient government." The willingness to transfer the police to provincial responsible ministers is the best indication of the extent of this concession. At Lahore, last Christmas I watched the police, controlled by a few white officers, and of course supported by the prestige of the troops in cantonments who made no official appearance at all, keep the city quiet during the extremely testing days during which the Congress was meeting and when racial hate was being freely expressed at the Congress in speeches meant to work mischief.

But I know too little to be able to affirm that the central federal authority, still dominated by Britain, and this really Indian provincial machinery, will work together without friction. The one thing needful is a spirit of coöperation. On the government side in India, and here at home I find a real readiness to co-operate in the interests of India. I am also sure that if our offers are accepted, there can be but one end to the great experiment—an India as self-governing as Canada is to-day. But now, as during last Christmas, desolation and even anger possess me when I see real concessions flung aside with contempt; peace, which is the greatest right that the Indian peasant can claim, destroyed under the guise of 'non-violence', and yet no real attempt made by the extrem-

ists to provide solutions for questions which will as certainly rise, the day after they take over, as the sun will.

There are hundreds of other questions calling for detailed discussion, but these notes can only pretend to be incitements to my Canadian friends to read the Report thoughtfully, realistically, and without any of that sham rhetoric of thought which annoys us here in some of our American critics (chiefly clerical). I think the elimination of Burmah a real simplification of the strictly Indian problem; and the determination to "treat the defence of India as a matter which should fall within the responsibilities of the Governor-general, advised by the Commander-in-chief," seems a first condition of making the experiment. For the rest, as an ordinary 'Britisher' who has given some attention to Indian questions, and found India itself far more fascinating, puzzling, and dominating, than ever I expected, I, and others here like me, mean to set before ourselves, as the only true objective, the welfare of the Indian peoples; we mean to try to get our Indian friends to coöperate with us in securing for India even more self-government than India can at first manage with comfort or even security; we have no desire to withhold from an ultimately autonomous federation the right even to separate from the Empire if such a course seems best for India. But we have no intention of allowing a minority of politicians and students to bully us into allowing the common folk of India to become the prey of internal strife, frontier raids, and Russian plots. The situation is obscure, but our prayer is that at the coming conference Indians representative of all shades of opinion will agree on some workable scheme, probably more advanced than that of the Report; that they will understand the reality of our wish to coöperate with them, and that, together, we may gradually create, as has been done in Canada, a form of government fair to all sections, genuinely free, and capable of maintaining

that *Pax Indica* which has been the greatest gift of England to India.

I have said nothing here of Gandhi — too complex a subject to add to all the other complexities which I have merely touched on. Let me say that I think him great as a moral force, inspiring the young men of India as few are doing either in India or elsewhere at present. But as a political leader, if I may borrow a phrase from Meredith, he is as little constructive, or useful, or sane, as “a flash of lightning in a grocer’s shop.”

WHAT ARE CANADIANS MAKING OF THEIR COUNTRY?

BY J. MACKINTOSH BELL

A RECENT distinguished visitor to our shores when asked what he considered the salient feature of Canada, replied "Waste". Are we, indeed, so improvident of our resources that we deserve this serious accusation? Have we become so accustomed to the great blessings that nature has bestowed upon this country of ours, that we can stupidly imagine that her natural resources will be continually renewed like the widow's cruse? Are we able and willing to make Canada a permanent country, in the true sense of the word? Are we as a people, balanced in our endeavours, imbued with lofty ideals for the preservation and conservation of each phase of our natural heritage, or are some of our great cities to be as evanescent as the once-prosperous colonies of Greece and Rome, in North Africa, where to-day are the ruins of great buildings shrouded in the desert sand?

It is said that when the news of the fall of Quebec and the consequent transfer of the greater part of the North American domain of France to Great Britain was told to Madame de Pompadour, then the favourite of Louis XV, that lady exclaimed: "It makes little difference; Canada is useful only to provide me with furs." The days when Canada could be regarded only as a source of peltries to deck the beauties of the European courts, have long since departed. Canada has become one of the great exporting countries of the world, and one sees the produce she grows or manufactures in the world's most distant markets. Her progress in this respect should persist and even increase if her people, in harmony with her governments, unite in protecting the natural wealth upon

which her trade depends. Were we as poor as Lazarus but had our natural wealth unimpaired, potentially we should be rich as Dives. The citizens of Canada are now regarded as second only to those of the United States in being the richest per capita in the world.

One staggers in fact at the recent amazing growth of our prosperity and our endeavours. No longer are our settlements limited to the rim of our southern frontiers. The most distant confines of our country are being combed for new opportunities for turning the natural wealth into dollars. Already commercial enterprises engage in the fisheries of the great lakes of the remote north, while mining companies have seemed to be intrigued, rather than discouraged, by distance in their quest for new mines. The aeroplane no longer startles the Indians as it descends on their formerly sequestered waters. The radio has brought us into daily communication, so to speak, with the Eskimo of our Arctic shores.

It is said that "no people now or in times past has destroyed its soil so rapidly" as those of the United States. If it is amazing that so great a nation should thus neglect an irreplaceable resource, is it not even more astounding that we, who have had so admirable an object lesson, should be no less guilty? We can confidently look forward to the day when the new agricultural settlements now forming in the fertile valley of the Peace River will have spread still farther northward to the valley of the Liard or even possibly to the southwestern shores of the Great Slave Lake—that great northern fresh-water sea—where, until recently, the fur trader and the missionary formed the only human link with civilization. Our souls kindle with justifiable pride as we see this expansion but can we view with equanimity the sight of many fields in the older west, now no longer productive or under summer fallow, but abandoned to the sow thistle, the dilapidated buildings and fences proclaiming an effort that has failed? Even the extra-

ordinarily productive soil of Manitoba is not inexhaustible; even it cannot stand indefinitely the unceasing annual cropping, unless some fertilizer is returned to tone it back to vitality. Fortunately, the importance of the production of artificial fertilizer in Canada is now becoming recognized. The numerous water-power sites north of the prairies would seem to be admirably suited for the production of nitrate.

The steady growth and improvement of the new settlements in northern Ontario and Quebec form a pleasing antidote to the abandoned farms of the Laurentian highlands of the interior of old Ontario. Over much of this stretch of the country agricultural settlement should never have been attempted; it was doomed to failure at its inception. The rocky hills will never grow again those forests of stately pine "so high and so thick that the light of day never penetrated." Still the provincial government's decision to allow such land as is abandoned for fairer fields by the struggling inhabitants to revert to bush is full of prescience and wisdom. There are similar opportunities for the governments of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec to separate the areas really suitable for agriculture from those whose most profitable crop must ever be that originally planted by the hand of God.

Most of British Columbia is not, in any sense of the word, an agricultural region. There are areas of cultivated land—some relatively spacious—in the southern part of the province and minor isolated patches in some of the valley bottoms close to the railways of the central portion. The highly mountainous character of its topography negatives its possibilities in this direction. But what a vast resource it has in the forests which fill the valleys and creep up the steep slopes to the grassy alps bordering the snow line! Would that these could be protected with the same zeal as in Scandinavia, that relatively new section of European civilization, which resembles British Columbia so closely in its physical features! One shrinks from seeing

great conifers, with stumps three feet in diameter, being felled for firewood and one wonders how long it will take for nature to reforest those great areas where now only blackened rampikes tell of the glories that have been.

The protection of the forest is more difficult in a mountainous region like British Columbia than in the lake-filled, forested hinterlands of Ontario and Quebec, where of recent years real advance has been made in the prevention of forest fire. Yet still we are told that the annual loss by this depredation is greater than the value of the reduction of forest wealth through the cutting of timber and pulp! Artificial reforestation is, in great part, impossible in the thinly-settled areas of northern Ontario and Quebec, but the country will reforest itself if repeated forest fires do not destroy the young trees and the productivity of the soil which in many places forms a scant covering over widespread rock. In the forested regions of central Siberia—Canada's Asiatic counterpart—once in great part a private domain of the Russian Imperial family, an effective preventative to the spread of bush fires was produced by great swaths cut through the trees at intervals. These were left entirely free of scrub and were guarded by experienced rangers. One wonders—now that an autocracy, at times benevolent, has been replaced by an oligarchic bureaucracy—if those fine stands of timber are still as carefully guarded.

The remoter parts of northern Ontario and Quebec, northern Manitoba, northern Saskatchewan and much of the Mackenzie District are forested, but, except along the valleys of the larger streams or in positions of favourable soil and drainage close to the lake margins, the timber is small and suitable for firewood only, or at best for pulpwood. While the exportation of the better timber from these more distant sections of the country is not, at the moment, a practical issue, the forest is a valuable asset for local use and will become more so as settlement spreads. Forest growth in those regions of

brief summers and Arctic winters is much slower than in British Columbia or the more favoured portions of Ontario and Quebec. Not in this day and generation will nature overcome the damage done by the fires which, in the summer of 1928, swept vast stretches of the country adjacent to the new Hudson's Bay Railway as well as practically all of the region around Reindeer Lake, and were burning in a hundred places down the Slave River and around Great Slave Lake, filling the dry air with a dense curtain of smoke through which the sun glimmered redly upon black destruction.

In a region so well supplied with water as our wooded north there is perhaps less reason to fear that with the denudation of the bush there may emerge areas of permanent desert such as may now be found in various parts of the world. Progressive dessication due to or concurrent with forest removal has reduced extensive sections of Northern China to stretches of arid sand. In Roman times cultivations and great cities dotted the southern slopes of the Grand Atlas and extended on to the plain beyond. Like locusts the Arabs advanced, cutting down the trees to provide grazing ground for their flocks. Destruction of the agricultural lands followed in the trail of rapid erosion. With the progressive and inevitable increase in arid conditions, the Sahara invaded an erstwhile smiling land, bringing about the gloomy desert conditions now taxing the ingenuity of the French to stem. The progress that they have made in this respect in Algeria, Tunis, and to a lesser extent in Morocco, is one of the pleasant features of modern old world development. This change from forest to desert conditions, though relatively rapid as geological time is measured, is not, of course, quick as we see it. A much more rapid result of the destruction of the forest is the depletion of the fur-bearing animals and of the game.

Keen competition between the various fur-trading concerns—large and small; the introduction of white trappers,

generally much more skilful than the Indians; the ruthless methods pursued by many of the newcomers, which the natives emulate or even endeavour to excel, and forest fires are responsible for the almost complete annihilation of species of wild animals formerly prolific in many sections of the country. It is said that one may travel across the snow fifty or sixty miles in certain areas formerly well stocked without seeing a single track. The Government, fortunately, by its preservation reserve at Wainwright, has saved the buffalo for posterity and more than six thousand of these fine beasts have been transported within recent years to join their woodland brothers west of the Slave River near Fort Smith. One wonders if the barren land caribou, accustomed to herd together during the breeding season in great bands, is doomed to extermination. They are still numerous but the Déné Indians of various tribes, who resort each year to the Barren Lands, will hasten their elimination if they are allowed to do so unhampered. When a big band is encountered the killing does not cease till the ammunition is exhausted. One wonders too how long the beaver and other fur-bearing animals will be able to escape the fate of the wild pigeon, formerly so numerous as "to darken the sky" in their flight.

The fur industry is still important; its pursuit is the natural life of the Red Indian and the Eskimo. To these earlier Canadians we of this day owe a large obligation. Their hereditary instincts and inclinations make them the fit inhabitants of inclement areas where the white man can be, at best, but a transient. If the fur industry dies, there is not only a material loss to Canada, but the dwindling aborigines will have to be saved from starvation by the Government. In shielding the Eskimo can we not learn from the patriarchal government of Greenland, which has a monopoly of the fur trade and where the natives (with, it is said, a considerable admixture of Danish blood) are holding their own against pernicious foreign

influence? It is good news to learn that the Canadian government is introducing herds of reindeer for the benefit of the Eskimo of the western Arctic littoral as has apparently been done successfully in connection with their brothers in northern Alaska. As Dr. Nansen said in his sympathetic introduction to Diamond Jenness' charming book *The People of the Twilight*: "They too are doomed, if nothing really effective is done to protect them. The land of the white silence will never more ring with the happy mirth of these lovable children of the twilight. Surely the Canadian people and authorities will not allow such a thing to happen."

In the millions of lakes, varying in size from the tiniest ponds to great freshwater seas, Canada holds a pasturage for teeming fish life, providing immense stores of food. On the Banks of Newfoundland, the government of the United States watches to preserve fish "seed" from waste. As Boyden Sparks stated not long ago in *Popular Science*, "they are hatched at shore stations and then liberated by the billion to fend for themselves in that boundless pasture we call the ocean." Our Government carries on similar operations in Lake Superior, on the Pacific Coast and elsewhere and, we may hope, will soon do the same in less frequented waters, such as Lake Athabasca, where lake trout and whitefish are being netted in large numbers and rapidly transported to the markets of New York, Chicago and other big cities with little restocking as yet being done.

No country of similar size in the world is so magnificently endowed as Canada with water power sites at the innumerable waterfalls occurring throughout the greater part of the country. Already these have been utilized to a great degree and largely on account of the cheap supply of electric power developed therefrom we have become a great manufacturing people. Our cities, towns, and many of our farms are brilliantly lighted; our housewives have an easy means of cooking.

and our mines and forest industries have been expeditiously developed. This phase of activity in Canadian life continues apace; it is, in fact, susceptible to almost unlimited expansion.

A few years ago Sir Thomas Holland, at that time chairman of the geological section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, delivered an address in Toronto dealing with the known supply of metallic elements in the world at that time. It was an interesting and illuminating address and the careful listener could not but be impressed with the fact that the world was using its known supplies of metals at an alarmingly rapid rate—some elements, of course, much more quickly than others. Though Canada is only the third in importance of the British nations as regards annual value of mineral output, being exceeded both by Great Britain and by South Africa, she has within recent years made much greater relative progress than almost any other country. The annual returns from our mines and quarries is now enormous and should show steady increase, at any rate for some time. Scarcely a year passes without new and important mineral discoveries. These great discoveries, even in remote localities, are not only important in themselves but because of the secondary industries which follow in their train. Often in the history of the world the men who have found the mineral treasures have been but the advance guard of a larger and more enduring form of population. Great, however, as is our known and potential mineral wealth, it is not inexhaustible. No mineral wealth in any part of the world can be so described. It is essentially a wasting asset and should be so considered. For an indefinite period of time it will continue to provide wealth and labour to our citizens. We must hope that as much as possible of this wealth shall remain here to continue the quest for new mines, to build up other industries, and to foster the arts, letters and other lofty endeavours of our country.

Canada contains approximately 3,700,000 square miles.

Certainly, not more than one-quarter of this vast area is suitable for agriculture—the most important Canadian industry—but, even if the amount of land under cultivation or potentially tillable is very much less, we can multiply our agricultural population many times and still have much good land to spare, provided farming—rather than mere grain mining—is undertaken. The portions of the country not suitable for farming have timber resources, water powers, mineral potentialities or are useful for the fur trade and as a source of fish. There is no large part of the country, not even in the Arctic Islands, but that in the dim future can be made profitable to our citizens if they have sufficient imagination and foresight to visualize the possibilities and turn them into actualities. We suffer in Canada, in fact, from a plethora of riches. Were our resources less, were the effort necessary to develop them greater, we would be less improvident. Under democratic conditions waste seems to be inevitable in a new country in the early stages of progress; but Canadians are emerging from their adolescence and they need to pursue a constructive policy worthy of the great country that is theirs.

Recent years have shown remarkable progress in the Dominion's economic structure and, on every side, one sees evidence of expansion in exploration, development and production. The responsibility of sustaining this progress lies with the Canadian people. May that luxury, so often the handmaiden of prosperity, not contain the roots of decay which, as every student of history knows, has from time immemorial led to the downfall of nations and individuals! With a zeal equal to that with which the early pioneers embarked on the great enterprise that has now become the Dominion, may we resolutely safeguard both our spiritual and economic future!

PENELOPE'S TREES

BY JOHN DRINKWATER

Why does my little girl love Trees?
What is the circumstance of these
Husht baby vigils, as she lies
Exploring with her stedfast eyes
The lacy woven boughs that fill
Her sky's arch with a map as still,
As limpid, as the eyes that stare
Unwinking on those Indies there?

The budded twigs innumerably
Curling and pointing print the sky
With figures that are wonder told
To wonder that is five months old;
A fretted world with heavenly blue
In isles enchanted shining through;
Than she, did Drake or Cortez know
A lovelier archipelago?

And thus at noon she will adore
The Kingdom of her Sycamore,
Spanning the lawn with giant girth
Of boughs long builded from the earth
They say since first a George was king.
With less than half a year to bring
Of learning to her scrutiny
She loves her stark, her winter Tree,
Not knowing yet of green or shade,
And of its winter unafraid.

Or when they set her where the sun
May kindlier nurse a little one,
And watching there she can but see
A dwindling, ragged Apple-tree,
Fallen upon an age forlorn,
With limbs a thousand gales have torn,
Still does she search it with the bright
Sweet gravity of her delight;

And knowing not that on the year
Fruit comes by falling blossom here,
Yet her glad infancy tells these
For boughs of the Hesperides.

And when along the hedgerow way
They take her, still the Hawthorn spray
With scarlet berries overhung,
The leafless Ash with roots among
The Bramble roots, with here and there
An Oak of all but acorns bare,
Elders with paler wands to show
The winter garment of the Sloe,
And Wild-rose bushes gypsy bright
With hips that top the hedge's height,
All, as she passes, lightly spread
Across the pathway, overhead,
That from her pillow still she sees
The ceremony of the Trees.

So when the 'days are still. And when
The wind comes up from Ouse and Fen,
Blowing as Huntingdon can boast,
Blowing the gulls down from the coast
To inland pastures now that yield
A harvest of the flooded field,
Then do her Trees rouse from their trance,
And spin upon the sky, and dance,
Dipping and mounting in the air
Till all is movement everywhere,
And still her lucid heavenward gaze
From earth no higher to heaven strays,
For risen from the earth she sees
Her heavenly miracle of Trees.

Summer will come, and five months grow
To a year's wisdom, and will know
Her Sycamore in splendid green
Broad leaves that with their beauty screen
The present beauty of the sky.
Upon her Apple-tree will lie

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY

Garlands of tender misted bloom;
Cluster and fan and cloud and plume
Of flower and fruit and foliage bless
Her blessed Trees their nakedness,
Elder and Thorn and Ash and thoe,
Oak-apple Oak, Dog-rose, Dog-rose,
And be her infant song to these
Transfigurations of her Trees.

But now, before the time of leaf,
Before the time of song, when brief
Her calendar is five months told,
The winter Trees all stripped and cold
Have spoken in a language heard
By worship that has found no word.
Hush! she's awake. Of such as these,
Your Kingdom too, O friendly Trees.

POPULAR BELIEFS OF SHAKESPEARE'S DAY

WINIFRED MARY STEVENS

THREE hundred years hence, when the human mind has overcome disease, when human ingenuity has annihilated mice, mosquitoes and other such pests, when science has eliminated time and space, our own day will appear a veritable age of black ignorance. Bearing this in mind, we look back on our brothers and sisters of three hundred years ago with no thought of disdain or even superiority. The distance which we have travelled since then in the pursuit of knowledge is ground not for pride but above all for joyful anticipation. "We have come far, have we not far to go? Wonder shall yet outwonder all we know." Moreover, in spite of their comparative ignorance, they left us a vast heritage of beauty—how will our legacy to our descendants in this respect compare with theirs? But the beliefs of the Elizabethan period are after all quaint to twentieth century minds. Shakespeare considered them of importance, and has crowded into his works an amazing number of these popular fancies—just another proof of his unparalleled interest in whatever concerns human nature.

I well remember being told by an old nurse that with every sigh we lost a drop of blood—there are several references to this in Shakespeare. Similarly he mentions more than once the nine lives which sixteenth century cats enjoyed in common with their twentieth century cousins. Crocodile tears were known then too, the story being that a crocodile ate a man; when the head alone remained, the beast was seized with remorse and shed tears: he then ate the head!

Omens were heartily believed in, many of them with the same significance as to-day. A howling dog portended disaster, a raven, infection or ill news. The cricket's cry was a death

omen, so were unusual physical phenomena—storms, meteors and, above all, eclipses. Your ears burned, then as now, when your friends were thinking about you; nose-bleeding and various bodily pains presaged surprise. Dreams might denote good or ill fortune, stumbling was unlucky, especially over graves.

Natural history was delightfully supplemented and aided by imagination; during an electrical storm the thunder stone actually fell; toads, lizards, newts, blind-worms and spiders were all venomous, a horse-hair would turn to a worm or a snake in water, adders were deaf; deer were known to weep, as was also the "melancholy hare." The woodcock had no brains, the chameleon lived on air, the swan sang one sweet song before its death, the eagle, alone of birds, could gaze at the sun. A dead king-fisher, hung up, would always turn its bill to the wind, the pelican actually fed its young on the blood from its own breast, the basilisk bore murder in its glance. The osprey fascinated fish, so that they turned over, thus becoming easy prey. The phoenix hatched no offspring, but arose with new life from its own ashes. Poets of all times have loved this symbol of purification and re-inspiration through death. In his sonnet on Shakespeare's *Lear*, Keats writes:

"But when I am consumed in the fire,

Give me new Phoenix wings to fly at my desire."

The owl was once a maiden, a baker's daughter. One day Jesus came in disguise to the baker's shop, and asked for bread. The mother was willing to give it but the daughter refused, and for her lack of generosity was changed to an owl.

The roots of the mandrake or mandragora (used in medicine chiefly as a soporific) resembled the human form, and were used by witches to personate the victims of their sorceries. When torn from the ground, these roots uttered dreadful shrieks, driving all who heard them mad. To obtain them without incurring this danger, Bullein (1575) tells:

“Therefore they did tye some dogge or other lyving beast unto the roote thereof wythe a corde, and digged the earth in compasse round about, and in the meane tyme stopped their own ears for feare of the terreble shriek of this Mandrack. In whych cry it doth not only dye itselfe, but the feare thereof kylleth the dogge or beast which pulleth it out of the earth.”

More fantastic still was the old superstition concerning barnacles. Gerard (1597) tells of the Goose tree or Barnakle tree “whereon doe growe certaine shell fishes, of a white colour tending to russet; wherein are contained little liuing creatures: which shels in time of maturite doe open, and out of them grow those little liuing things; which falling into the water, doe become foules, whom we call Barnacles.” Gerard had himself seen, in a small island in Lancashire, branches of trees cast ashore, “whereon is found a certaine spume or froth, that in time breedeth vnto certaine shels, in shape like those of the muskle but sharper pointed, and of a whitish colour. The little living thing contained in each of them falleth in course of time into the sea where it gathereth feathers, and groweth to a foule, bigger than a Mallard and lesser than a Goose; hauing blacke legs and bill or beake, and feathers blacke and white”; and he further affirms: “For the truth heerof, if any doubt, may it please them to repaire unto me, and I shall satisfie them by the testimonie of good witnesses.” Now barnacle goose being proven fish and not flesh, many a fat priest or monk might therefore eat his fill of it in Lent. This valuable construction was no doubt responsible for the general acceptance of the fable, and for its long continuance: we find it from the reign of Henry II down to the time of the Puritans. And so on through these quaint beliefs—Lyly’s *Euphues* is said to be responsible for perpetuating much of this “Un-natural natural history.”

Human anatomy was equally picturesque. The brain consisted of three ventricles. Memory being the lowest is

mentioned by Shakespeare as the "warder" of the brain; and it is not until it has been overcome (in the case of intoxication or passion) that the fumes pass on to attack reason. The stomach was headquarters not only of appetite but also of pride and courage; the liver held courage too, (a coward was lily-livered) as well as love and passion. The spleen was responsible for anything carried to excess, ungoverned by reason—immoderate sorrow or mirth. It was therefore the seat of rancour, jealousy, hate, despondency, which by their nature are beyond the pale of reason.

Human beings were subject to four humours or complexions (or compounds of these) the four humours answering to the four elements in nature—fire, choler; water, phlegm; earth, melancholy; air, blood. Thus, if your humour were under the influence of the fiery element, you would be choleric; if the watery element, phlegmatic, and so on. Outside influences also worked on these humours, as in the case of anger caused by eating over-done meat. In addition to one of four complexions, you were endowed with five wits: wit, imagination, fantasy, estimation and memory. You also had in constant attendance nine imps; and over and above all, your presiding genius for good or evil. Is it any wonder that the course of things did not always "run smooth"! Over-shadowing and influencing all these were the stars, but of them more later.

Worms played an important part in the human body. Conscience was a worm, not always as still as might be desired. Toothache was caused by a worm at the root of the tooth, and might be stilled by drugs or exorcised by incantations. Worms also bred in the fingers of idle maids.

England fortunately never knew the orgy of poisoning which cursed other parts of Europe at this time, but poisoning was by no means unknown. It was common belief that it could

be administered through the ears, as in the case of Hamlet's father.

Remedies were different from those of to-day. Every housewife knew more of simples and herbs than her great-great-grand-daughter, and made a practice of gathering, storing and using them. The age-long remedy of cobweb (the dirtier the better) for a cut finger was quite common; flax and white of egg were also used to dress wounds. The treatment of the mentally afflicted was tragically cruel: they were kept bound in a dark room and frequently beaten. Murder was more common then than now, and gave rise to curious beliefs. A murdered body would bleed in presence of the murderer, stones would move and trees speak to reveal murder.

There were apothecaries' shops, the essential part of the stock in trade being apparently an alligator stuffed. Bleeding was supposed to be "physical", that is salutary, especially at certain seasons; to be healthy you should be periodically bled. The *carduus benedictus* or holy thistle was a general cure-all; but more potent still, if it could be obtained, was the melted gold of the alchemist, which was believed to be a general elixir of life. In the hereafter, old maids were to lead apes in hell, and old bachelors under similar conditions to become bear-herds.

Then there were delightful or malignant supernatural beings, with whom we do not associate to-day. Most charming of all were the fairies, lovable little people, not intellectual nor spiritual, but dainty, bright, pretty, very cleanly, light and airy; loving flowers, moon, twilight, dew; delighting in beauty. They worked and played chiefly at night and brought dreams. They also brought tangible gifts, including fairy gold. If you were lucky enough to receive any of that, you must "keep it close" (secret) or it would vanish. They endowed the new-born babe with gifts and fairy favours, and generally added to the beauty and joy of life.

But there existed also mischievous fairies, from the laughter-loving Puck to more serious malefactors. Sometimes they even stole children and left changelings in their stead. They visited stables by night with torches which they held over the horses' heads, till the melted wax tangled the manes inextricably. You might even get elfin locks yourself, should you incur their anger. Or they changed at will into animal forms to torment the poor traveller, or lead him astray as a fitful will-o'-the-wisp.

More to be dreaded were the witches, ugly, bearded, old women in wild attire, with supernatural powers of prophecy and spells. They brewed horrible messes in their cauldrons, attended by their familiars, weird toads, cats and owls. They could kill swine by "overlooking," and could not only foretell fortune or calamities, but actually produce storms, plague and famine. They could not drown: being in league with the devil and having therefore renounced baptism, water could not touch them. The witch of fiction holds us with horrible fascination, but we cannot forget the unpardonable, ghastly cruelty meted out to helpless old women accused of witchcraft—we are told that in the year 1598 alone six hundred supposed witches were burnt. It is indescribably pathetic to think of these poor women, each with a human body and soul, victims of ignorant superstition.

Sorcery of all kinds was practised—palmistry, divining, incantations, bewitching music, magic mirrors. If you collected and carried fern-seed, it would render you invisible. Should you wish to wreak vengeance on an enemy, you made a wax effigy of him: whatever harm you did to the effigy, your victim would suffer; you could burn him, stab him, mutilate him at your pleasure.

And of course there were ghosts, usually accompanied by blue lights. But if your conscience were clear, you had not much to fear from them. It was, however, dangerous in any case to cross their path or stand where they had stood. They

might be the murdered seeking revenge, or might have other reasons for walking—the drowned were condemned to wander a hundred years. They usually appeared about midnight, were never seen after the first cock, would not speak till spoken to, and any scholar could exorcise them in Latin.

More powerful still for good or ill were the devils, who usually wandered alone but sometimes went yoked. They possessed mines of gold and enjoyed superhuman power. Should you fraternize with a devil, you must feed him with a long spoon, and if in your greed for pleasure or riches you made an agreement with him, you must seal it with your blood. The devils kept an exact register of all such agreements and never failed to exact their due.

One cannot but be struck by the constant references to astrology in Shakespeare's plays, the influence of the stars and planets and of the moon. "The stars above us govern our conditions." But here, as elsewhere, Shakespeare places them before us, uses them with delightfully ornamental effect, then sits back with his inscrutable smile watching our unavailing efforts to discover what he really thought about them. We do not know. But in this case he almost lifts the mask, he seems to disclose a kind of indignant impatience, crying to his fellow-men: "Shake off this stultifying submission to fate. The fault is in ourselves."

The most beautiful of those old beliefs was concerned with the harmony of the spheres. Although the Ptolemaic system of astronomy was accepted the stars not only moved—they sang for joy. As they revolved in their crystal spheres, each one emitted its own music, all combining to form the harmony of the spheres. Science has long told us that no such harmony can exist, but fortunately the wonders of modern discovery encourage us to believe nothing impossible. The music of the spheres will at least always live in the souls of the poets. Their minds are so attuned to it that it drowns for them the discords of earth, and rings in triumphant harmony through their songs.

JUDICIAL APPEALS TO THE PRIVY COUNCIL

I. THE CASE FOR DISCONTINUING APPEALS

BY JOHN S. EWART, K.C.

SELF - RESPECT. — The best reason — the all-sufficient reason why Canadians should settle their own law-suits, without the intervention of a group of non-Canadians sitting three thousand miles away, is based upon Canadian self-respect. As the Chief Justice of Canada has said:

“While this subordination of our courts is maintained—while this badge of inferiority is attached to them—our vaunted Dominion status as a full partner in the Empire seems an idle boast, a sop thrown to our vanity.”¹

And, as Professor A. Berriedale Keith has said:

“A further and decisive mark of dependency is the appeal to the Privy Council. Nothing is more absurd than to pretend that this appeal is maintained voluntarily.”²

Self-help.—With the exception of these appeals, Canadians arrange without over-seas assistance all their affairs—tariffs, banks, fisheries, great industries, railways—management of these last having been transferred with conspicuous advantage from London to Montreal. Cannot we settle our own law-suits? During many past years we have arranged all questions arising between us and the United States. And now our own international affairs are adjusted by exchange of ministers - plenipotentiary with Washington, Paris, and Tokio. Cannot we settle our own law-suits? In the earlier days the Bishop of London exercised ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Canada. Now we arrange our own ways of getting ourselves to heaven. Our internal, external, and eternal affairs

¹Quoted in Canadian Hansard, 1927, page 1713.

²*Responsible Government in the Dominions*, 1928, page 1149.

are all arranged in Canada—all except the law-suits. Why not except, also, fixation of the rates of fare on our street cars? That, too, might be sublimated into “a valuable link of Empire.”

The Committee's View of Itself.—When, in 1900, Australia decided to place a limit upon the appeals, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council defended themselves in a memorandum which I quote in divided italicized sections, and reply to, as follows:

1. “*It is impossible to overlook the fact that this jurisdiction is part of Her Majesty's prerogative, and which has been exercised for the benefit of the colonies since the date of their settlement.*” The appeals were instituted, not for the benefit of the colonies, but for the purpose of keeping control over them. In 1875, when Canada proposed to cut off the appeals, the Committee defended itself in a memorandum in which they said:

“To abolish this controlling power and abandon each colony and dependency to a separate Court of Appeal of its own would obviously be to destroy one of the most important ties connecting all parts of the Empire in common obedience to the courts of law, and to renounce the last and most essential mode of exercising the authority of the Crown over its possessions abroad.”³

It is for this reason that all attempts to cut down the appellate jurisdiction have been “justly regarded with jealousy” by the British Governments⁴; and that stout resistance has been offered both to Canadian⁵ and Australian⁶ proposals for release.

It is hardly fair to refer to the appeals as “part of Her Majesty's prerogative.” Lord Haldane (afterwards Lord

³May's Constitutional History (1912), Vol. 3, p. 321.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Keith, *Responsible Government in the Dominions*, 1928, Vol. 3, p. 1365.

⁶Ibid, pp. 1365-72; Ewart, *The Kingdom of Canada*, pp. 231-6.

Chancellor), when debating the Australian Commonwealth bill in the House of Commons, said that:

"The expression of which in these debates we have heard much 'the Queen's prerogative', is a mere technical phrase and should be put aside."

2. "*It is still a powerful link between the Colonies and the Crown of Great Britain.*" For the reasons supplied by Mr. Haldane that statement is not true. The Crown has nothing to do with appeals. Links moreover, based upon subordination, ought not to be allowed to exist.

3. "*It secures to every subject throughout the Empire the right to redress from the throne.*" The Committee are usually much more truthful than might be judged from this double-barreled misrepresentation. No subject residing in England, Scotland, or Northern Ireland has the right to "redress from the throne." Under various circumstances that right does not exist in the Dominions. When it does exist, it can be exercised only by the rich, for the man of ordinary income cannot afford the expense. Appeals, moreover, never go to "the throne" except for signature. And when, in pursuance of feudal form, the King signs a decision, he exercises no more intellectual association with the document than if he were a manikin manipulating a rubber stamp.

4. "*It provides a remedy in many cases, not falling within the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts of justice.*" So far as Canada is concerned, that is not true.

5. "*It removes causes from the influence of local prepossession.*" Unfortunately for Canada that is true. The people of every country have their prepossessions, and English judges are no exception to the rule. And so, if when referring to "local prepossessions", the Committee meant that Canadian judges are familiar with all the features of the *milieu* in which Canadian cases arise; that they understand the customs and habits which

prevail among the Canadian people; and that they are able to observe the features of the cases in their proper perspective and as against appropriate background, then I may confidently affirm that to remove litigation from men so well equipped, and to submit it to judges who carry with them a wholly different set of prepossessions is to make a very absurd change. The hollowness of the argument, moreover, may be seen if we ask whether English lawyers would apply it to their own cases. When Mr. Chamberlain proposed an Imperial Court of Appeal, he was told that the idea of submitting English cases to a conglomerate court was ridiculous. That it would help to remove causes from "local prepossessions" was true, but for that very reason the proposal was heartily condemned.

6. *"It affords a means of maintaining the uniformity of the laws of England and her colonies, which derive a great body of their laws from Great Britain."* To this there are three replies:

(1) It would be difficult to name a single decision of the Court which has had beneficial effect in the respect referred to.

(2) If "uniformity of the laws" be a desideratum, we must commence not with the courts, but with the legislatures. In Canada, we have nine of them making diverse laws; in Australia there are six; and in the United Kingdom, although there is but one parliament, the English system of law is fundamentally different from the Scotch. We cannot have uniformity in the courts until all these legislatures adopt the practice of passing uniform statutes.

(3) But is uniformity-pressure by the Privy Council desirable? In the debate on the Australian Commonwealth bill Mr. Asquith gave their Lordships credit for acting on precisely contrary principles. He said that it had been their special care to maintain:

"most zealously and scrupulously, the integrity of the different systems of laws;" that they "have prevented, as far as they can,

any filtration of ideas from a foreign source of law which might permeate and corrupt another system. . . . You cannot have a uniform interpretation of diverse systems of law."

These observations are specially applicable to constitutional questions; and, if we should ever have an Imperial Court of Appeal, with Australian judges taking part in the decision of Canadian constitutional cases, it will be impossible that we shall escape endeavours to make our constitution conform to theirs. The naïveté of the suggestion as to uniformity may be appreciated when we remember that the House of Lords and the Privy Council are unable to keep themselves in harmony. At the Imperial War Conference of 1918, Sir Robert Borden said:

"And sometimes we have this anomaly, that a decision of the House of Lords which is binding upon English Courts, and a decision of the Privy Council which is binding upon the courts of the various Dominions, may not be entirely consistent."

7. "*It enables them, if they think fit, to obtain a decision in the last resort from the highest judicial authority, composed of men of the greatest legal capacity, existing in the metropolis.*" When dealing with cases within the ambit of their experience and learning, the Committee may be regarded as being composed of men very well fitted for their work. But they are not so well able to deal with cases outside that limit (for example with questions involving the construction of federal constitutions, or the Quebec Codes, or relating to systems of land registration,) as are other men who have the advantage of them in that respect.

Unsatisfactory Experience — Dominions Secondary. — Among the reasons for the unsatisfactory working of the appeal system is the fact that Dominion cases are regarded (naturally enough) as of secondary importance. The Lord Chancellor and the Law Lords sit judicially both in the Privy

Council and in the House of Lords. Some of them are good. Some are not so good. And when, as often happens, both courts are simultaneously at work, apportionment of the judges has to be made, what happens? Mr. Haldane (afterwards Lord Chancellor), speaking in the Commons on the Australian Commonwealth bill, said:

“If there are two tribunals sitting for the despatch of the same business, the one is starved in order to keep up the other, and the judicial strength inevitably gravitates toward the House of Lords; and until you make the colonials feel that the tribunal to which they come is the same as that to which you yourselves appeal, you will never get their confidence. The result has been that though the Privy Council is considered good enough for the colonies, it is not allowed in Great Britain and Ireland to be good enough for us.”

In a pamphlet published in 1905 Mr. Haldane said:

“Again the state of the Supreme Court of Appeal is unsatisfactory. Just now it is split into the House of Lords which acts for England, Scotland and Ireland, and the Judicial Committee which acts for the rest of the King’s dominions. The neglect of statesmen has led to the second being starved for the sake of the first.”⁷

To the same effect Professor Keith has said:

“The present system does mean the inferiority of the status of the Dominions, for the Privy Council does not rank in importance with the House of Lords, and if there are many cases to be heard, it is the Council which has the poorer Judges allotted to it.”⁸

Not only are the poorer judges assigned to the Privy Council, but sometimes only three of them make their appearance. Complaint on this score was made during the Conference of 1907. Improvement was promised, but the same condition continues. During last year the complaint was renewed.

⁷Quoted by Professor Pollard in *The British Empire*, p. 771.

⁸Keith, *op. cit.*, 1102.

Carelessness or Indifference.—Other reasons contribute to the carelessness or indifference which sometimes characterizes the judgments of the Committee. One is that the judge who writes the judgment feels himself free from apprehension, not only from criticism by a court of appeal (for there is none), but from any of his brother judges whose opinion does not coincide with his (expression of dissent is not allowed);⁹ and from the English Law journals, for the English Bar takes little interest in Dominion cases. The following are examples of what sometimes happens. When giving judgment in one case, the Committee said:

“It was not denied by the counsel for the respondents that the powers, rights, privileges, and franchises belonging to the respective companies who were predecessors of the appellants have been taken up and carried forward by reason of the various transactions of amalgamation and otherwise, and are now vested in the appellants.”

But that statement was contrary to the fact. The stenographic report of the argument proves that the fact which the Committee said “was not denied” was combated to the extent (at one place) of twenty-one pages; that the members of the Committee took part in the discussion; and that it finished with the remark of the Lord Chancellor: “I think we now appreciate your point.”¹⁰

In another case involving over thirteen million dollars, the Committee said:

“It would be a breach of faith with the Grand Trunk Railway Company to let in any further charge in priority to their security.”

⁹ “The habit of delivering one judgment only makes for blunders.” Keith, *op. cit.*, 1091, note 3.

¹⁰ *City of Winnipeg v. Winnipeg Electric Ry. Co.*, 1912, A. C. 355. When the Committee’s statement reached Winnipeg, it evoked fierce denunciation, but of the wrong men, the *Manitoba Free Press* saying, among other things: “The people of Winnipeg are still waiting to know who is responsible for hauling down the city colors and abandoning the fight, and why Sir Robert Finlay was not instructed to hold the ground already won for the city.” The case is more fully commented upon in 33 *Canadian Law Times*, 475.

The Committee overlooked the fact that what they said would be a breach of faith to the company was contained in an agreement that was submitted to the shareholders of the company at the general meeting and was ratified by them.¹¹

In another case, two partners asserted that transactions entered into separately by the third partner were really partnership affairs. There were a number of such transactions, each having its own peculiar circumstances. When counsel for the third partner proceeded before the Committee to argue the cases separately, he was stopped, the Committee saying that they would declare some general principle and refer investigation and decision of the cases to the Master of the Court. Lord Moulton saying that the Master "would have to decide on the facts in each case, and it is not for us to decide on the facts in each case."

Under these circumstances none of the cases was fully argued, some of them were not even touched. But their Lordships must have forgotten that circumstance, for in giving judgment, instead of referring the cases to the Master, they made a sweeping declaration upon all of them as against the third partner. At the conclusion of the delivery of the judgment, counsel for the third partner pointed out to the Committee what they had done, but they bluntly refused to reconsider their action. That is the clearest case of judicial indifference to the rights of a litigant that is known to the present writer.¹²

In another case the appellants had two points—say, A and B. In his opening address appellants' counsel abandoned point A, and said with reference to point B: "I am content really to rest my case on that." Under those circumstances, counsel for the respondents did not argue point A. Never-

¹¹Rex v. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The case is more fully commented upon in 33 *Canadian Law Times*, 475.

¹²Kelly v. Kelly, 10 D.L.R., 343.

theless in giving judgment the Committee decided in favour of the appellants upon that point alone.¹³

Carelessness in the extreme was exemplified when the Committee, overlooking a clause in a Quebec statute, declared that the enactment was *ultra vires*. The statute was one imposing taxation upon successions to the estates of deceased persons. It provided that certain individuals should make a declaration in verification of a schedule of assets, and that declarants should pay the tax. The Committee said:

"Their Lordships can only construe these provisions as entitling the collector of Inland Revenue to collect the whole of the duties on the estate from the person making the declaration, who may (and as we understand in most cases will) be the notary before whom the will is executed, and who must recover the amount so paid from the assets of the estate, or, more accurately, from the persons interested therein."

Proceeding upon this view, the Committee held that the tax was of indirect nature, and consequently *ultra vires* of the province. But the Committee had overlooked a clause which specifically exempted notaries from making the declaration and consequently from liability to pay. The ground, therefore, upon which the Committee declared the statute to be *ultra vires* did not exist.

The Quebec Legislature resented the decision, and, while submitting to the loss of over \$20,000.00, bluntly declared in its statute of 4 Geo. V, Cap. 11, that the decision was erroneous, and prohibited, for the future, the instituting of any similarly founded action against the government. Professor Keith relates that the decision caused "much indignation in Quebec," which may account for the fact that "the Quebec onslaught was decidedly lacking in courtesy."

Subversive Explosions.—Unheralded and destructive as earthquakes, come occasionally subversive explosions from

¹³Rex v. Alberta Railway Company, 1912, A. C., 827.

Downing Street. By that is meant decisions which uproot and throw aside principles that Canada has regarded as settled—principles which sometimes have been imposed upon us by the Committee itself. The following are examples:

Russell v. The Queen, 7, A. C., 829. In this case the Committee decided that the Dominion Parliament had power to pass a statute providing for local option in connection with the sale of liquor. Many Canadians were doubtful of the soundness of the decision, for by the constitution "all matters of merely local or private nature" were declared to be exclusively within the jurisdiction of the provinces. Local option seemed to be peculiarly a local matter. Nevertheless, for many years the case was regarded as of leading importance. Mr. Lefroy in his *Legislative Power in Canada*, published in 1897-98, referred to it nearly fifty times. Upon various occasions, the validity of the case was questioned, and, finally, after a lapse of forty-three years (1882-1925) it was thrown aside by the Committee itself, their Lordships saying that they thought:

"that the decision in *Russell v. The Queen* (1882), 7 App. Cas. 829, can only be supported to-day, not on the footing of having laid down an interpretation, such as has sometimes been invoked of the general words at the beginning of section 91, but on the assumption of the Board, apparently made at the time of deciding the case of *Russell v. The Queen*, that the evil of intemperance at that time amounted in Canada to one so great and so general that at least, for the period, it was a menace to the national life of Canada so serious and pressing that the national Parliament was called on to intervene to protect the nation from disaster. An epidemic of pestilence might conceivably have been regarded as analogous. Their Lordships find it difficult to explain the decision in *Russell v. The Queen* as more than a decision of this order, upon facts considered to have been established at its date rather than upon general law."¹⁴

¹⁴*Toronto Electric Commissioners v. Snider*, 1925, A.C., 396.

The "epidemic of pestilence" idea was a fantastically ridiculous improvisation and did not escape judicial refutation in Canada, the Chief Justice there saying:

"In alluding to the Lemieux Act judgment, I feel that I should respectfully take exception to the suggestion there made, that the Board which decided *Russell v. The Queen* must be considered to have had before their minds an emergency putting the national life of Canada in unanticipated peril, as the occasion of the enactment by Parliament of the Canada Temperance Act, 1879, I cannot find anything in the judgment delivered by Sir Montague E. Smith in the *Russell* case suggestive of such a view having been entertained by the Judicial Committee. On the contrary, the whole tenor of the judgment seems to me inconsistent with its having proceeded on that basis."¹⁵

Woodruff v. Attorney-General. Another important decision of the Committee suffered like fate. After some inconsistent decisions (1882-1903)¹⁶ the Committee appeared to have decided definitely in *Woodruff v. Attorney-General* (1908, A. C., 508) that the provinces had no power to levy a succession tax in respect of property locally situated outside the provinces. That decision was implicitly disapproved by the Committee in *Rex v. Lovitt* (1912, A. C., 212). And shortly afterwards it was practically reversed in *Cotton v. The King* (1914, A. C., 176), the Committee saying as follows:

"The decision in the case of *Woodruff v. The Attorney-General for Ontario* was much relied upon on behalf of the appellants, but the circumstances of the case were so special, and there is so much doubt as to the reasoning on which the decision was based, that their Lordships have felt that it is better not to treat it as governing or affecting the present decision, and they have accordingly decided the present case entirely independently of that decision."

¹⁵*The King v. Eastern Terminal Elevator Company*, 1925, S.C.R., 438.

¹⁶*Blackwood v. Reg.*, 1882, A. C., 82; *Harding v. Commissioners*, 1898, A. C., 769; *Lambe v. Manuel*, 1903, A. C., 68.

That was not a very frank confession. The circumstances of the Woodruff case were not "special." And the "reasoning" although faulty was clear enough.

Nadan v. The King. In 1888 a Dominion statute declared that there should be no further appeals to the Privy Council in criminal cases; and, at other periods, the provinces passed statutes limiting the cases in which civil appeals might be taken. These statutes all remained unimpeached until 1926, when the Committee declared (*Nadan v. The King*, 1926, A. C., 482) that the Dominion statute was *ultra vires*. The reasons given were equally applicable to the Provincial statutes. And so laws that had stood in Canada for very many years were swept aside. Canada has no control over the final disposition of her law-suits.

The Bonanza Creek, etc., v. King. In Canada there have always been two methods of incorporation: (1) by special statute; and (2) by letters patent issued by the governments under their respective Joint Stock Company's Acts. Prior to 1916, when preparing a charter under these Acts, the governments were always careful to define with scrupulous precision the extent of the power which was to be conferred upon the Company. They had developed policy as to the inadvisability of permitting combination of unrelated activities. And the courts had unanimously held that every action of a company not authorized expressly or by necessary implication by its charter was *ultra vires*. In 1916, by the decision of the Committee in the Bonanza Creek Case (1916, A. C., 566,) these practices and policies were extinguished.

In England companies are sometimes incorporated in a third way, namely by the exercise of one of the old-time prerogatives of the sovereign. And the very curious characteristic of the prerogative charter is that, although it may purport to grant authority to do one class of actions only, the company really has power to do everything else not expressly prohibited.

Observe now the effect in the Bonanza Case of "local prepossessions." In Canada no one would have imagined that charters regarded as having been issued under the Joint Stock Company's Acts were in reality prerogative charters. Canadians had no idea that the English practice of charters by the sovereign, which to some extent had fallen into disuse, was the practice under which the large majority of their companies had come into existence. On the other hand, judges familiar with such charters, and more impressed with the importance of the maintenance of prerogatives easily inferred from the presence upon the charters of the signatures of the governors (as required by the Joint Stock Company's Acts) that their validity rested upon the prerogative and not upon the Acts. And so they declared that Canadian charters issued by the government under the Joint Stock Company's Acts were really prerogative charters. The Committee arrived at their decision in this way. They said that:

"there can be doubt that, prior to 1867, the Governor-General was for many purposes entrusted with the exercise of the prerogative power of the Sovereign to incorporate companies throughout Canada, and such prerogative power to that extent became after confederation, and so far as provincial objects required its exercise, vested in the Lieutenant-Governors, to whom provincial Great Seals were assigned as evidences of their authority."

But the Committee had not made the slightest investigation as to the powers of the Governor-General prior to 1867. And their assertion with reference to it was absolutely foundationless. Professor Keith, when referring to "the famous ruling" of the Committee, said that it:

"seems to have rested on the quite false belief that Lieutenant-Governors of Canadian provinces possessed a general delegation of the prerogative right to issue charters conferring on corporate bodies the capacity of natural persons, a view for which there is absolutely no evidence, the fact being

that, when it was proposed to issue such charters, special authority was conveyed to the Lieutenant-Governor."

Mr. Justice Hodgins discussed the decision of the Committee at considerable length in the *Canadian Bar Review*,¹⁷ and said:

"In discussing the pre-confederation powers of the Governor or Lieutenant-Governors it may be confidently stated that in so far as they depend on the text of the commissions and instructions to Governors and Lieutenant-Governors (printed by the Archives Department in Ottawa), the statement on page 580 of the report of the Bonanza Case is not borne out, namely that prior to 1867 the Governor-General was for many purposes entrusted with the exercise of the prerogative power of the Sovereign to incorporate companies throughout Canada."

The decision of the Committee may well be characterized as a subversive explosion. For by it the power of every company, previously incorporated by letters patent, was increased from that specified in its charter to the full extent of all the powers which the Legislature had jurisdiction to confer upon it. A company with power to manufacture buttons in Toronto found itself capable of undertaking the construction of electrical works in Russia. And the decision was one arrived at, be it observed, as the result of a combination of "local prepossession" and gross carelessness.

Attorney-General v. Colonial, etc. Australia and each of its states, like Canada and each of its provinces, enacted legislation authorizing their respective governments to appoint commissions for the purpose of investigating subjects over which they had legislative control. Acting under its statutes, Australia appointed a commission to enquire into the operations of the sugar industry. But the commissioner was blocked by the refusal of persons interested to answer his questions upon the ground that they were unnecessarily inquisitorial.

¹⁷Vol. 4, p. 85.

An application for an injunction to restrain the proceedings of the commissioner came before the Australian High Court, with the result that two of the judges agreed with the commissioner and the other two with the witnesses. Upon appeal to Downing Street the Committee said that it was:

“impossible to say in advance which of these questions, if they can be insisted on at all, may not turn out in the course of a prolonged inquiry to be relevant or even necessary for the guidance of the legislature in the possible exercise of its powers.”

That was curious enough. But still more curiously the Committee went off upon a totally different and absolutely unanticipated course, eventually holding that the Australian statute, under which the commission had issued, was *ultra vires*, and that the commissioner, therefore, had no authority to ask questions of any kind.

Australia was startled not only by the decision, but still more by the reasoning by which it was supported. Very clearly the difference between the views of Australia (and Canada) and the Committee upon the point raised was due to wide disparity in their “local prepossessions.” In their judgment the Committee said that:

“A royal commission has not, by the laws of England, any title to compel answers from witnesses.”

After quoting some of the questions that had been put to the manufacturers in the course of the investigations, the Committee added as follows:

“These are examples taken from a series of questions which obviously must disclose many details of the mode in which the company carries on its business. To be compelled to answer them is a serious interference with liberty.”

—an interference with liberty, although the questions, as their Lordships said, might:

“be relevant, or even necessary, for the guidance of the legislature in the possible exercise of its powers.”

With this idea of liberty in their minds, their Lordships reviewed the provisions of the Australian constitution under which the federal parliament obtained its powers, and added:

“None of them relate to the general control over the liberty of the subject, which must be shown to be transferred if it is to be regarded as vested in the Commonwealth.”

Canadians and Australians do not share their Lordships' view that there is “a serious interference with liberty” when manufacturers are asked for such disclosures as may be necessary for the information of parliament in connection with the regulation of business affairs. Difference in prepossession accounts in this case as in many others for difference in opinion. The Committee further said as follows:

“It is, of course, true that, under the section, the Commonwealth Parliament may legislate about certain forms of trade, about bounties and statistics, and trading corporations. Such legislation might possibly take the shape of statutes requiring and compelling the giving of information about these subjects specifically. But this is not what the Royal Commission Acts purport to do. Their scope is not restricted to any particular subject of legislation or enquiry, and no legislation has actually been passed dealing with specific subjects such as those to which their Lordships have referred as matters to which legislation might have been directed giving sanction to some of the inquiries which the Royal Commissioners are now making.”

So Parliament, in the opinion of the Committee, had jurisdiction to appoint commissions, as many as they pleased, but could not authorize its government to make appointments. To this there are two replies: (1) A sovereign parliament (and for the purpose in hand the parliament was sovereign) can devolve upon other bodies the powers which it itself possesses. (The Committee had forgotten that, on several occasions they

had themselves so said¹⁸) ; and (2) "A serious interference with liberty" is as objectionably evident in the one course of procedure as in the other.

Voicing the feeling in Australia, Mr. Hughes, the Australian Prime Minister, spoke at the Imperial Conference of 1918 as follows: (*Italics now added.*)

"Especially in relation to its decisions on the Commonwealth Constitution, the Privy Council has not proved a satisfactory tribunal. That Constitution has special features of its own—features which differentiate it from the Canadian Constitution, and some of which bear close resemblance to the Constitution of the United States. It is a complex instrument, almost every line of which has its roots in Australian history, and bears the marks of an ultimate compromise between conflicting views. The eminent Judges ordinarily available on the Judicial Committee, for all their legal learning and judicial experience, have not among them a single man who is intimately familiar with this Constitutional document, or with the vital processes underlying it, a knowledge of which is, in the case of any Constitutional document, necessary, to a full appreciation of both letter and spirit. Australia's experience of the Privy Council in constitutional cases has been, to say the least of it, unfortunate."

After referring to the State income tax case, Mr. Hughes added:

"A more striking instance of this was the more recent Royal Commission case, Colonial Sugar Refining Company v. Brown.¹⁹ Its decision is one which must have caused great embarrassment and confusion, if it were not for the fortunate fact that the reasons for the Judicial Committee's decision are stated in such a way that no court and no counsel in Australia has yet been able to find out what they were. That is what must happen when a tribunal on the other side of the world, no matter how eminent and experienced its members may be, has cast upon it the duty of interpreting a complicated con-

¹⁸Hodges v. The Queen, 9, A. C., 132.

¹⁹Maritime Bank v. Receiver General, 1892, A. C., 437; Dobie v. Temporalities Board, 7, A. C., 146; Lefroy, *Legislative Power in Canada*, 689.

stitutional document with the history and principles of which no member of the court, and perhaps no counsel practising before the court, is especially familiar."

Mr. Hughes fortified his attitude by a quotation from a judge of the Court of Appeal in New Zealand in which it was said that the Committee:

"by its imputations in the present case, by the ignorance it has shown in this and other cases of our history, of our legislation, and of our practice, and by its long-delayed judgments, has displayed every characteristic of an alien tribunal. If we have spoken strongly, it is because we feel deeply. And we speak under grievous and unexampled provocation."

Conclusion.

Were it worth while and did space permit other cases of character similar to those above criticized could easily be added. But it is not necessary. May I not safely take for granted that men absolutely unfamiliar with systems prevailing in Canada cannot satisfactorily deal judicially with cases arising under those systems? Even if they could, is there any reason why, of all countries in the world in population and intelligence equal with Canada, our great Dominion should be the only state that is willing to acknowledge its inability to settle its own law-suits?

JUDICIAL APPEALS TO THE PRIVY COUNCIL

II. THE CASE FOR APPEALS

BY GEORGE H. SEDGEWICK, K.C.

THE fundamental objection to Mr. Ewart's position in the matter of appeals to the Privy Council is that his point of view with respect to all our relations with the Mother Country is wrong. The Kingdom Papers, the Independence Papers, and the more recent series wherein Mr. Ewart proved so conclusively that every war in which Great Britain was concerned was brought about by the folly, stupidity, or wickedness of the Mother Land indicate that Mr. Ewart's point of view is that of a person who believes that Canada is and of right ought to be free and independent. His bias, using the word strictly, appears, therefore, to one who desires that Canada ought to remain in the British Empire to give a wrong cast and a wrong emphasis to every instance he gives in support of his claim that the appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council should be abolished.

I propose to deal with Mr. Ewart's objections to the appeal by following some at least of the headings under which those objections are grouped. I think I can show that substantially all of his objections can be successfully met but I recognize that even in doing this the heart of the question has not been reached. The wisdom of maintaining appeals must be based on vastly different considerations.

A peculiar reason for abolishing the appeal is found by Mr. Ewart in the Judicial Committee's own view of itself. He goes back to memoranda prepared by the Committee in 1875 and in 1900. Our constitutional development, even since 1900, has been so great and so much water has run under the bridge

since then that one might reasonably pay little attention to an argument based on those memoranda. In any event, my reasons as a Canadian for regarding the appeal as valuable may be very different from those which sixty or thirty years ago seemed valid to the Committee itself, and may have some validity even if the Judicial Committee never thought of them.

Mr. Ewart says that it is "hardly fair to refer to the appeals as part of Her Majesty's prerogative." There seems to be no doubt that there are two classes of appeal, namely, those which lie by virtue of Imperial, Dominion or Provincial legislation, and those which lie by virtue of the royal prerogative. The Ontario Act relating to appeals to the Privy Council expressly provides for appeals in certain cases to the Judicial Committee, while the Supreme Court Act of the Dominion which provides that the judgment of that Court shall be final and conclusive and that appeals shall not lie to the Judicial Committee contains this significant exception—"saving any right which His Majesty may be graciously pleased to exercise by virtue of his royal prerogative." The section of the Criminal Code respecting appeals expressly enacts that there shall be no appeal to the Judicial Committee "notwithstanding any royal prerogative." These Acts indicate that there is an appeal by virtue of the royal prerogative and that the fact of its existence is recognized by the Parliament of Canada. The Judicial Committee has in many judgments recognized the existence of both classes of appeals. If and when the Imperial Parliament repeals the Colonial Laws Validity Act so far as that Act affects Dominion legislation, then, if the Dominion Supreme Court Act and the Criminal Code retain the existing provisions respecting appeals, there can be no appeal to the Judicial Committee in a criminal case, but appeals from the Supreme Court to the Judicial Committee will continue in the same manner as they do now and that expressly by virtue of the royal prerogative.

I pass over for a moment Mr. Ewart's discussion of the appeal as being or not being a link of Empire or as securing to every subject the right to redress from the throne or as removing causes from the influence of local prepossession. Whether or not the appeal provides a remedy not falling within the jurisdiction of the ordinary Courts of Justice is of little significance. There probably is technically such a remedy still existing though I cannot imagine what the cases are and how the right may arise. In any event, the question at issue is appeal or no appeal in respect of decisions of our courts of justice, and it is hardly fair to use this alleged jurisdiction, quite beside the point of this discussion, as "arf a brick" to throw at the poor "strangers" of the Judicial Committee.

Mr. Ewart suggests untruthfulness on the part of the Judicial Committee when its memorandum states that the appeal "secures to every subject throughout the Empire the right to redress from the throne." Mr. Ewart calls this a "double-barrelled misrepresentation." It is not in fact a misrepresentation. I shall quote later from the judgment in the *Nadan* case the remarks of Lord Chancellor Cave on the point expressly contrary to Mr. Ewart's statement. Mr. Ewart may still say he is right and that I am wrong but I have the authority of the Lord Chancellor of Great Britain in a judgment of our highest appeal court.

Even if the right does exist, says Mr. Ewart, it can be exercised only by the rich. That is true in all litigation. The more important the case the more it costs. In the case of the *Toronto Railway Company v. King*, L.R. 1908, A.C. 260, the wife and daughter of a delivery-van driver killed by a street car in Toronto obtained a judgment against the Toronto Railway Company. The Court of Appeal for Ontario ordered the case sent back for a new trial, a great expense to the widow and daughter. The Railway Company appealed to the Judicial Committee claiming that the action should be dismissed.

The Judicial Committee not only disallowed the appeal but allowed the widow and daughter to appeal then and there against the Court of Appeal's judgment and reinstated the trial judgment—such a relief for the poor widow and daughter and such a cutting through of red tape as only “the throne” could or would attempt. I like the last paragraph of their judgment:

“The respondents in their printed case asked that the judgment of the Court of Appeal might be set aside and the verdict of the jury restored. Some doubts having arisen whether they were competent to do so on this appeal, without having first lodged a cross petition in that behalf, their Lordships, being of opinion that the necessary relief would undoubtedly have been granted to them if they had applied for it at the time when the Appellants obtained special leave to appeal, allowed the respondents at the hearing to put in such petition *nunc pro tunc*, and they will humbly advise His Majesty to grant this relief.”

There is something to be said for the position taken by the Judicial Committee in the memoranda derided by Mr. Ewart, that the appeal to the Judicial Committee affords a means of maintaining the uniformity of the laws of England and her colonies which derive a great body of their laws from Great Britain. It seems to me that the statement refers only to those of the Colonies which are under the English system, and to uniformity not of statute laws, but of the principles of English Common Law and Equity. Mr. Ewart says “It would be difficult to name a single decision of the Judicial Committee which had the reforming effects in the respect referred to.” We have had just such a situation in Canada. In the case of *Cox vs. Adams*, 35 S.C.R. 393, the Supreme Court of Canada held that when a person dealing with a husband takes a guarantee or security from the wife he must see to it that the wife has independent advice. That judgment, pro-

nounced in 1904, was, without doubt, not in accord with English law but it remained a binding authority and was followed in Canada until in another Canadian case, *Bank of Montreal vs. Stuart* L.R. 111, A.C. 120, the Privy Council overruled the judgment in *Cox vs. Adams* and brought the Canadian law on this point once more into line with that of England. There is much to be said in favour of providing a means of keeping English and Canadian law respecting ordinary and common business transactions as nearly alike as possible. This is so obvious as to render discussion unnecessary. I can think of no means to this end other than such a body as the Judicial Committee with the necessary appellate jurisdiction.

There is a possibility, rather remote, that the House of Lords as a Court of Appeal and the Judicial Committee may be out of line the one with the other. This, however, is a matter which may be worked out, as all matters under British practice have been worked out, when the serious situation definitely arises. It is not a fantastic fancy to believe that some day the Appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords and of the Judicial Committee may be united in one Court of Appeal for the Empire.

Mr. Ewart suggests—and apparently Professor Keith is of the same opinion—that the Dominion cases are regarded by the Law Lords as of secondary importance, and he quotes remarks of Lord Haldane made in 1900 and 1905 in support of this contention. The years 1900 and 1905 belong to a remote period in relation to the matter under consideration. Lord Haldane himself tells (*Autobiography*, p. 249) of his efforts to strengthen the Judicial Committee. "One of my ambitions," he says, "in going to the Woolsack was to accomplish what I had for many years seen to be necessary, the strengthening of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. . . . For want of judges that Tribunal has been too often allowed to sit with

only three members present, to hear appeals from Dominion Courts of five judges. The Dominions had begun to criticize the composition of the neglected Court and to point out that the available judicial strength was being concentrated in the House of Lords in preference to it." Later in the same work Lord Haldane tells what he accomplished. "Returning now to the composition of the Judicial Tribunals of the House of Lords and the Privy Council I managed in 1913 in the face of a good deal of difficulty to get an Act through which enabled us to add two new paid Law Lords to the service of these tribunals. Over this and over the appointment of the two very distinguished judges, Lords Dunedin and Sumner, who were chosen to fill the new posts Asquith as Prime Minister was most helpful . . . I was also fortunate enough to be able to secure the help of two other distinguished lawyers, Sir Alfred Cripps and Lord Justice Buckley, for the work. They took peerages as Lord Parmoor and Lord Wrenbury in 1914 and 1915, and although wholly unpaid worked as hard as though they were in receipt of salaries. Further assistance of the most valuable kind was after my time rendered by Lord Phillimore, who was made a peer, and a good deal by others."

"If there are many cases to be heard it is the Council which has the poorer judges allotted to it," says Professor Keith. What are the facts? The Law Reports, Appeal Cases, 1929, contain reports of five Canadian appeals to the Judicial Committee. The courts were as follows:—No. 1. Lord Chancellor Hailsham, Viscount Sumner, Lord Warrington of Clyffe, Lord Atkin and Chief Justice Anglin; No. 2. Lord Chancellor Hailsham, Viscount Dunedin, Viscount Sumner, Lord Atkin and Chief Justice Anglin; No. 3. Lord Chancellor Hailsham, Viscount Dunedin, Viscount Sumner, Lord Atkin and Lord Darling; No. 4. Lord Chancellor Hailsham, Viscount Dunedin, Viscount Sumner, Lord Atkin and Lord Buckmaster. The fifth case was heard by The Lord Chancellor, Lord Buckmas-

ter, Viscount Sumner, Lord Blanesburgh and Lord Warrington of Clyffe. Here we have five judges for each Canadian appeal. The appeals to the House of Lords from England and Scotland were heard by Courts made up from the same British judges and Lord Atkinson, Lord Shaw of Dunfermline, Lord Phillimore and Lord Carson. Usually five judges sat in House of Lords appeals but in at least three of them only three judges were sitting. No one can say that in the year 1929 the poorer judges were allotted to the Canadian appeals, and it is noticeable that the Lord Chancellor presided at all of them. Out of ten House of Lords Appeals in the same year in which I have examined the constitution of the Court the Lord Chancellor presided in only five and my list was taken quite at random. Considering that the Court is maintained without expense to us it seems that at least we got as good Courts as are obtained by litigants before the House of Lords.

Under the heading of Carelessness or Indifference Mr. Ewart has collected a number of instances where a judge writing the judgment for the Judicial Committee has apparently made a misstatement as to some position taken by Counsel in argument or as to some question of fact. Mr. Ewart mentions five cases, in two of which he himself was concerned, unfortunately, on the losing side. One generally requires special knowledge of such a case to be able to comment intelligently on it. No assistance can be obtained by reading the judgments. The real point in each case is not whether the Judge made a misstatement as to any position or fact, but whether by reason of the error a wrong decision was given and manifest injustice done. Mr. Ewart does not deal with the actual thing decided in any of these cases. It is conceivable that the eminent counsel on the winning side of the appeals under consideration would not agree with the suggestion that injustice was done.

One feels that Mr. Ewart has made out no case on this point. To succeed he must allege and prove that such carelessness is characteristic of the Court. This he has not done. The Courts guilty of carelessness or indifference in the two appeals in which Mr. Ewart was concerned were:—In the Winnipeg Electric case Earl Loreburn, L. C. Lord Macnaghten, Lord Atkinson, Lord Shaw of Dunfermline and Lord Robson; in the Alberta Railway case Viscount Haldane, L. C. Lord Macnaghten, Lord Dunedin and Lord Atkinson. It is impossible for any one who knows anything about the judges named to imagine that carelessness or indifference was characteristic of their work.

Mr. Ewart's comments under the heading of Subversive Explosions seem to me to be disingenuous. The judgment is *Russell v. The Queen* was apparently wrongly decided. Mr. Ewart says that many Canadians were doubtful of the soundness of the decision. Apparently he was doubtful of it himself and now he complains that after being embarrassed by it for nearly fifty years the Judicial Committee have at last worked out a method of getting rid of the embarrassment. The House of Lords have been similarly troubled and have from time to time adopted similar expedients for similar embarrassments. Our own Courts have done the same. Such embarrassments must occur so long as Judges have human limitations and the principle of *stare decisis* obtains in our system of law. If the Judicial Committee, knowing that a prior decision was manifestly wrong, still followed it to our prejudice then Mr. Ewart might justly criticize them but surely not when they get rid of a manifest error. The same remarks apply to the *Woodruff* case if that case was wrongly decided.

To regard the *Bonanza Creek* decision as subversively explosive is to my mind quite ridiculous. The reasons *may* be wrong. At least they were advanced by competent counsel. But, whatever the reasons, the decision saved a vast number

of companies in Canada from very serious embarrassment and expense. Mr. Ewart thinks the Judicial Committee suffer from ignorance of Canadian conditions. In this case they *seem* to have realized them more fully than the Supreme Court of Canada. The Bonanza Creek Company was incorporated as a Mining Company under the Ontario Companies Act, the Province having power to incorporate companies "with provincial objects." The Company obtained rights in the Yukon under an agreement with the Dominion Government. Disputes having arisen between the Company and the Dominion Government the Government which had contracted with the Company and accepted its money for which the Government presumably was to give some return, set up in defence to an action brought by the Company on its contract that the Company had no right, and could not by any means acquire the right, to carry on business in the Yukon. The Supreme Court of Canada upheld this contention. That Court held that a company incorporated under provincial laws could not carry on business outside its province except as incidental to its business in that province. For instance, The T. Eaton Company Limited could not operate a store in Winnipeg. The average citizen would say that if that was the law the law was an ass. The Judicial Committee reversed the Supreme Court of Canada and held that the Bonanza Company had the capacity to be licensed in the Yukon and upon obtaining such license to carry on its business there. The case does emphatically *not* decide, as Mr. Ewart contends, that a button company in Toronto may undertake the construction of electrical works in Russia.

Mr. Ewart may be correct when he says that the Committee had not made the slightest investigation into the powers of the Governor-General before 1867. But how does he know? Lord Haldane who wrote the judgment has been regarded as a fairly competent lawyer and judge. His experience before

the Judicial Committee was extensive and I should hesitate without giving some authority to make the statement Mr. Ewart has made. Professor Keith seems to deny the *power* in the Lieutenant-Governor to create a corporation by Letters Patent because the power was controlled by the Home Government. One can only say that after reading Professor Keith's reasons as quoted by Mr. Ewart it is still possible that Lord Haldane may have been right. In any event the directors of provincially incorporated companies in Canada and their legal advisers breathed a sigh of relief when the Bonanza decision was announced. The "explosion" would have been much more "subversive" if thousands of provincial corporations in Canada had found themselves confined to business within their own province only and that all their extra provincial branches were operating without any colour of right whatever. The fact that the Ontario Legislature immediately after the Judgment was rendered enacted its provisions as part of The Ontario Companies Act shows that this Province welcomed the "explosion."

The Nadan decision is cited as one of the explosive variety. The Judicial Committee upheld the decision of the Alberta Courts on the merits and said that Mr. Nadan was properly and legally fined. It also found that the bright lawyer who discovered that the Colonial Laws Validity Act and the Judicial Committee Acts were binding on Canadian Courts was correct in his views and that therefore the provisions of the Criminal Code abolishing the appeal to the Judicial Committee were ineffective for the purpose. I feel confident that Mr. Ewart, had he been sitting on the Judicial Committee, a position which he would adorn, would have given the same judgment. No Canadian criminal took on any new hope and no law-abiding Canadian experienced any fear by reason of the subversiveness of this explosion.

For every case Mr. Ewart cites as indicating the ignor-

ance of our conditions on the part of the Judicial Committee one could be cited from the Court appealed from which with equal justice could be claimed to demonstrate the ignorance of such conditions on the part of our own Courts. The Bonanza case is one. I do not mean that the Judges of our Supreme Court are ignorant of our conditions, but a similar criticism of them would be equally fair, that is to say, in the main, not fair at all. It is the business of counsel to see that the Judges do understand the conditions.

Mr. Ewart's fundamental error is that he regards the right of appeal to the Judicial Committee as a burden imposed on Canada as a nation. As a matter of fact this is not the case. The right of appeal is a property right or civil right which every British subject has as incidental to his right to petition and is, I think, in any event since the Judicial Committee Act of 1833, a right which every person entitled to sue in any court of the British Empire possesses by reason of his existence in a position where he can invoke the authority of a Dominion or Colonial Court. I can find no basis for Mr. Ewart's statement that "the appeals were instituted not for the benefit of the Colonies, but for the purpose of keeping control over them." The Judicial Committee Act confers no right other than a right of appeal to Colonial litigants. The right existed by way of a plea for the exercise of the Royal Prerogative long before any Judicial Committee Acts were passed, and I find it impossible to conceive how the Crown could be interested in maintaining any such proceeding as a means of exercising its own control. Viscount Cave, when Lord Chancellor, stated the point as follows: "The practice of invoking the exercise of the royal prerogative by way of appeal from any Court in His Majesty's Dominions has long obtained throughout the British Empire. In its origin such an application may have been no more than a petitory appeal to the Sovereign as the fountain of justice for protection against an

unjust administration of the law; but if so, the practice has long since ripened into a privilege belonging to every subject of the King. In the United Kingdom the appeal was made to the King in Parliament, and was the foundation of the appellate jurisdiction of the House of Lords. But in His Majesty's Dominions beyond the seas the method of appeal to the King in Council has prevailed and is open to all the King's subjects in these Dominions." (Nadan v. The King L. R. 482 at p. 491.) Statutes may create exceptions, but, speaking broadly, the Judicial Committee, regarding the right of appeal as a right in the individual appellant, has, as it should, regarded every statutory encroachment on this right with suspicion, and has adjudged the appellant to be not entitled to such right only on very clear and specific authority.

If then the right is a right of the individual there is no need for regarding the submitting the right of appeal as involving a lack of self-respect. Why should I lose my self-respect in availing myself of a tribunal which my residence in a British Dominion entitles me to make use of and if I and the majority of my fellow Canadians wish to preserve the appeal why should I and my fellow-Canadians feel any loss of self-respect? The appeal to the Judicial Committee is not a burden which I suffer but a right which I enjoy.

Not only does Mr. Ewart bear this grievous burden in common with the entity which he calls Canada, but he associates with himself Professor A. Berriedale Keith whom he quotes as saying that "nothing is more absurd than to pretend that this appeal is maintained voluntarily." It may be admitted that those who favour the abolition of the appeal have been much more vocal than their opponents. It is generally those who feel a burden who have the most to say, and it is possible that Professor Keith, who, like the Judicial Committee, lives far out of touch with our life, may have taken the noise as that of the multitude and not of the few. Nothing is more absurd

than to pretend that this appeal is not maintained voluntarily, subject to a qualification, which must be made with respect to Criminal Appeals.

How are we to determine that the appeal is maintained voluntarily? A valid method is to look at our Statutes. No later than 1927 the Legislature of Ontario caused the promulgation of its Revised Statutes. The Privy Council Appeals Act (R.S.O. 1927, Chapter 86, Section 1) says "where the matter in controversy in any case exceeds the sum or value of \$4,000 an appeal shall lie to His Majesty in His Privy Council; and except as aforesaid no appeal shall lie to His Majesty in His Privy Council." It is idle to say that this is perfunctory. The Act was the subject of amendment in 1926. If any party thought that public opinion was againset this appeal the opportunity then offered was too good to be missed. It is significant in this connection that one of the Opposition Parties in the Province was led in quite recent years by a gentleman who was personally opposed to the appeal.

It may be argued, however, that the Imperial Acts, namely, The Colonial Laws Validity Act and The Privy Council Acts have rendered it impossible to abolish the appeal, and that consequently the people have not thought it worth while to pass the abolishing legislation. If this were the case we should have some evidence of it in resolutions of legislative bodies. I have never heard of any such resolution being carried in any legislature in Canada.

Assuming that our legislators do not represent us, Mr. Ewart and Professor Keith may still hear the strong crying of a burdened people. Again I suggest that noise does not necessarily indicate multitude. Has any one ever heard of a public meeting being held in Canada to protest against the appeal? During the last month I have asked my friends and acquaintances for their views. I have spoken to many and not yet have I met one who would abolish the appeal.

The legislation of the Dominion in respect of these appeals is very interesting. The Criminal Code legislates as fully as it can against appeals in Criminal matters. Subsections 3 and 4 of Section 1024 of the Code which deals with appeals in Criminal cases are as follows:—

3. The judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada shall, in all cases, be final and conclusive.

4. Notwithstanding any royal prerogative, or anything contained in the Interpretation Act or in the Supreme Court Act, no appeal shall be brought in any criminal case from any judgment or order of any Court in Canada to any Court of Appeal or authority, by which in the United Kingdom appeals or petitions to His Majesty in Council may be heard.

These enactments have been in force for forty years and in practice were found effective. In the *Nadan* case, decided in 1926, however, the Judicial Committee held that the Privy Council Acts and The Colonial Laws Validity Act had the effect of overriding the provisions of the Code quoted above. As a practical matter the appeal was dismissed and *Nadan* obtained no relief. The Constitutional position is just one other instance so common in the development of the Empire where legislation has not kept pace with constitutional development with the result in this case as has happened time and again that an industrious and painstaking lawyer has hit on something which shows governments the necessity of making the laws fit the facts. The Report of the Conference on the Operation of Dominion Legislation and Merchant Shipping Legislation only recently printed, will, when the necessary legislation is passed in Great Britain, remedy the anomaly.

The Supreme Court Act of the Dominion of Canada R.S.C. 1927, c. 35, s. 5 provides as follows respecting appeals: "The judgment of the Court shall, in all cases, be final and conclusive, and no appeal shall be brought from any judgment

or order of the Court to any Court of appeal established by the Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland, by which appeals or petitions to His Majesty in Council may be ordered to be heard, saving any right which His Majesty may be graciously pleased to exercise by virtue of his royal prerogative."

When the legislation to be passed by the Imperial Parliament as a result of the Conference on the Operation of Dominion Legislation becomes effective the result will be that no appeal can be taken to the Privy Council in a Criminal case, but in respect of appeals in Civil cases the appeal from the Supreme Court of Canada will by virtue of our own Dominion legislation remain as it has existed since the Court was established, subject to be abolished at any time by appropriate legislation passed by our own Parliament and free from any Imperial control whatsoever.

The Report of the Conference on the Operation of Dominion Legislation is interesting as showing how carefully the Dominion authorities kept clear of any possibility of encroaching on provincial rights or offending provincial susceptibilities. In the discussion and recommendations respecting the Colonial Laws Validity Act the Dominions representatives limited themselves to their own jurisdiction. They did not even attempt to give the provinces *power* to dispense with appeals to the Judicial Committee. "The recommendations which we have made," so runs section 71 of the Report, "with regard to the Colonial Laws Validity Act do not deal with the problems of Provincial or State Legislation. In the absence of Special Provisions Provincial and State Legislation will continue to be the subject to the Colonial Laws Validity Act and to the legislative supremacy of the Parliament of the United Kingdom." Since the appeal to the Judicial Committee is almost the only place where the Colonial Laws Validity Act is practically operative in respect of Provincial Legislation the carefulness of the Dominion representatives to keep out of

trouble is impressive. They did not presume to enable the provinces to abolish the appeal even if they might wish to do so. It seems to me that this attitude on the part of our Dominion representatives indicates at least a doubt as to the desire of the provinces even to obtain the power to abolish the right of appeal in question.

I am not greatly concerned about maintaining the appeal to the Judicial Committee as a link of Empire. If any relation is maintained only as a link of Empire its value for the purpose is doubtful. The relation must be one which affected people regard with satisfaction. There was a time when the presence of British Garrisons in Quebec, Kingston and Halifax spoke comfortable words to the people of Canada. No one would suggest that bringing back the Garrisons would be a link of Empire to-day. The result would be to divide rather than to unite. If in the course of the years the Supreme Court of Canada overshadows the Judicial Committee in learning and quality the people of Canada may be relied on to take appropriate steps in the circumstances. In the meantime the people of Canada choose to maintain the appeal.

MR. EWART'S REPLY

To Mr. Sedgewick's article, I make the following replies:

1. The strength of my arguments upon the subject in hand is neither increased nor diminished by the nature of my opinions upon other subjects.

2. While successfully, as he thinks, overthrowing all my arguments, Mr. Sedgewick says that

“the wisdom of maintaining appeals must be based on vastly different considerations.”

If he could have thought of one of them, he would have mentioned it.

3. I stated, and I believe displaced, all the reasons which the Judicial Committee offered for the maintenance of the appeals. Mr. Sedgewick says that his reasons may be “very different”—

“and may have some validity even if the Judicial Committee never thought of them.”

If he could have thought of one, he would have mentioned it.

4. I said that it is “hardly fair to refer to the appeals as part of Her Majesty's prerogative.” Mr. Sedgewick points out that the language can be found in two Canadian statutes. That is true. As frequently happens, phraseology has survived its accuracy. Expressions often continue a ghostly life after their content is really dead. The King (as Mr. Sedgewick well knows) now exercises no discretion of any kind with reference to appeals. He probably did not observe that I quoted from Lord Haldane as follows:

“The expression of which in these debates we have heard much ‘the Queen's prerogative’, is a mere technical phrase and should be put aside.”

5. I said that it is not true that the appeal—

“secures to every subject throughout the Empire the right to redress from the throne.”

Mr. Sedgewick says that Lord Chancellor Cave has affirmed the contrary. But every lawyer (including Mr. Sedgewick) knows (1) that no one resident in England, Scotland, or Northern Ireland has any such right; and (2) that various statutes have imposed wide limitations upon the rights of others.

6. I said that any right which does exist can be exercised only by the rich. Mr. Sedgewick says that “that is true of all litigation.” If all his clients are rich, he enjoys a very specially enviable practice.

7. I referred to five cases in which as Mr. Sedgewick concedes—

“a judge writing the judgment for the Judicial Committee has apparently made a misstatement as to some position taken by counsel in argument, or as to some question of fact.”

Mr. Sedgewick says that to succeed upon this point, I

“must allege and prove that such carelessness is characteristic of the court.”

Not so, (Edward Blake's customary expression). Other courts do sometimes err, but they at all events operate under the check of dissenting judgments. No indication of minority criticism is permitted in the Privy Council. One of the reasons, moreover, assigned by the Judicial Committee for perpetuation of appeals, is that it is

“composed of men of the greatest legal capacity existing in the metropolis.”

If its members are no better than the best existing in Canada, no more free from defects, *cadit quaestio*.

8. I asked whether “uniformity-pressure by the Privy

Council is desirable?" Mr. Sedgewick says that "there is something to be said" for uniformity. If anything could have been said, Mr. Sedgewick would have said it. Would he commence with England and Scotland, and would he put uniformity-pressure upon Canadian legislatures?

9. I said that the Judicial Committee was regarded as of secondary importance to the House of Lords, and that sometimes the former has been "starved" for the benefit of the latter. Taking, "quite at random," the 1929 volume of the Appeal Cases, Mr. Sedgewick points out that five judges sat in each of the five cases. But by the purest and most unfortunate accident, his researches stopped just short of the case of the Canadian General Electric Company *vs.* Fadis Radio which was decided in the same year although reported in the next volume. In that case three, and, if there was any dissent, one member of the Judicial Committee reversed the unanimous decision of our Supreme Court. I suggest that Mr. Sedgewick write to the defeated Canadian counsel and ask him how he enjoyed his experience.

10. I asserted that some of the decisions of the Judicial Committee had the character of "subversive explosions." Law well settled and for many years maintained in Canada was, from time to time, completely upset by decisions in London. I referred to one case (*Russell vs. The Queen*) in which an extremely important decision of the Committee remained law in Canada for nearly fifty years, and was then annulled by the Committee. Mr. Sedgewick commends the action, for by it "they got rid of manifest error." The "manifest error" was their own. We had worked it into our law as best we could. And at the end of half a century our faithful work was subversively exploded.

11. Among the decisions of that kind, I mentioned the Bonanza Creek Case. Mr. Sedgewick so far agrees with me as to say that the reasons given by the Privy Council "*may* be

wrong." He seeks to justify the decision upon the sole ground that its effect was publicly beneficial. Whether or not that is true is, for the present purposes, immaterial. From a legal point of view, the decision is one of the worst ever delivered by the Judicial Committee. That it proceeded upon a purely fictitious basis (as Mr. Justice Hodgins pointed out), Mr. Sedgewick does not, and cannot deny.

12. Mr. Sedgewick says that he "can find no basis" for my statement that

"the appeals were instituted not for the benefit of the Colonies, but for the purpose of keeping control over them."

Mr. Sedgewick did not observe that in my article I quoted the Judicial Committee itself as saying that

"To abolish this controlling power . . . would obviously be . . . to renounce the last and most essential mode of exercising the authority of the Crown over its possessions abroad."

13. Mr. Sedgewick impeaches Professor Keith's statement that "nothing is more absurd than to pretend that this appeal is maintained voluntarily." But note, firstly, that he admits that the statement is true in so far as it relates to criminal cases. Secondly, he forgets that when our parliament was erecting our Supreme Court in 1875, the bill provided for the cessation of all appeals to the Privy Council, and that our government was told by the Colonial Office that unless the clause was eliminated the whole bill would be disallowed. Thirdly, he forgets the somewhat similar experience of Australia in 1900. Fourthly, he is evidently not aware of the twice repeated refusal of the Irish Free State to be bound by the decision of the Judicial Committee. Finally, he himself quotes the Ontario statute which provides that with the exception of cases involving \$4,000 "no appeal shall lie to His

Majesty in His Privy Council." He might have quoted parallel provisions from the statute book of every Province. The limitation in Quebec extended to \$12,000. And he might have noted that all these limiting statutes have been erased by the effect of the Privy Council decision in the *Nadan* case. The Provinces seem to have thought that although the Colonial Laws Validity Act forbade termination of appeals, its provisions might to some extent be evaded. We now know that relief can come only by the repeal of the prohibiting statute.

14. Self-respect is a matter for one's self. Some people do not object to being members of a subject race. Others do—as in India and Egypt. For me, Canadian subordination in any aspect is intolerable. And in closing, I repeat my quotation from the Chief Justice of Canada:

“While this subordination of our courts is maintained—while this badge of inferiority is attached to them—our vaunted Dominion status as a full partner in the Empire seems an idle boast, a sop thrown to our vanity.”

Any one avid of that sort of sop is welcome to my share of it.

THE RAVEN AND THE SUN

BY ROBERT AYRE

ONCE upon a time, long before the White Man was born, no one lived in Canada but the Indians and the wild animals, and they lived in utter darkness. The Great Chief, Nass-shig-ee-yalth, and his friends dwelt by themselves in tents at the mouth of a river in the North and hoarded all the light. The stars Nass-shig-ee-yalth kept hidden in a bag and he treasured the sun and the moon in two boxes, one painted with silver paint and the other gilded with gold. The Great Chief was proud of his possessions and he loved to pore over them as misers pore over their riches. "I am a wealthy man!" he would boast, as he undid the string of his bag and ran his fingers through the glittering stars. "I am the richest man in the world! Look, my friends!" He was fond of astonishing his friends and they never ceased being amazed, no matter how often he revealed the light to them. He would beckon them to his side, and while they gathered close and watched him loosening the lid of one of the boxes he would look up at them with a sly smile. Suddenly he would move his hand and the light of the sun or of the moon would pour out of the box in such a blaze of glory that it would seem as if the tent were afire and the men would stagger back blinded. Nass-shig-ee-yalth would laugh and clap the lid on the box, and never would he tire of playing this game.

But the poor Indians in the world outside sat huddled in the darkness and cold, shivering and hungry, because they had no fires and they could not see to hunt. All they could do was grope about in the blackness and find roots and berries with their fingers, dry, tough roots and green berries that could never ripen. They were in a miserable plight, but they thought their

wretchedness was ordained by the Spirits, for they knew nothing of sun, moon or stars. Had they known that there was such a thing as sight, they would have imagined that they were all born blind in a blind world.

The Great Chief was aware of their misery but it made him all the more vain and arrogant. "See how poor and cold and hungry and naked they are!" said he. "And see how powerful am I!"

"Will you not lend them some of your light?" asked one of his friends, who had a soft heart.

Nass-shig-ee-yalth turned upon him in a fury. "Not a star!" he cried.

But there was one being who took pity on the plight of the poor Indians, and this was the Raven, who flew about the world and had eyes so sharp that he could pierce the darkest gloom. He was soaring over the river in the North one day when he saw a gleam of light dart up into the black sky. The Great Chief was showing his sun to his friends and an urchin of the Great Chief's village had stolen in to look and had left the teepee flap open. The light flashed and disappeared and the Raven heard the Great Chief laugh.

The Raven wheeled and dropped closer to the tent. Then he poised on his broad wings and peered in through the smoke-hole. He saw Nass-shig-ee-yalth gleefully undoing the string of his bag. Nass-shig-ee-yalth's grin was lit up by a radiant glow as he opened the mouth of the bag. He turned the bag upside down and poured the stars out on the ground. Some of them lay in a dazzling heap and others rolled helter-skelter everywhere, dancing and twinkling and sparkling and making such a light that the Raven could see every wrinkle of Nass-shig-ee-yalth's leering face and could count his yellow teeth. The Great Chief gathered up the stars in his brown hands and fingered them lovingly before he put them back in the bag. When one of the children darted forward to help him pick

them up, he shouted so angrily that the poor child fled from the teepee in terror.

A great rage took hold of the Raven's heart as he saw the miser hoarding all the light of the world and he thought of the hapless Indians crouching in the darkness. He flew away but he resolved to come back and steal the stars.

When the Great Chief was sleeping by his smouldering fire that night, the Raven stole in through the smoke-hole. He saw a bag hanging from one of the poles, which he thought was the bag of stars, and, quickly seizing it with his beak, he jerked it away and flew off with it. But he soon knew, from the smell that came out of the bag, that he had made a mistake. He had stolen a bundle of dried fish. As soon as he perceived this, he opened his beak and let his burden drop. It fell into the midst of a starving family that sat shuddering and blind beside the fearful tumultuous ocean and knew nothing of fish. But the poor Indians seized the bag and tore it open and devoured every shred. The story of the miraculous fall from heaven passed rapidly from Indian to Indian and tribe to tribe, until all the Indians in Canada were gazing up sightless into the unbroken black sky and holding out their hands in the hope that heaven would open again and that more food might drop down.

Once again, the Raven let himself into the tent of Nass-shig-ee-yalth to steal the light for poor mortals, but this time the Great Chief awakened and caught sight of him as he flew in. With a cry of surprise, the Great Chief sprang up and clutched at the Raven. But the bird was too swift for him. He sprang into the air, dodged, and with one stroke of his great black wings vanished through the hole in the top of the teepee. Nass-shig-ee-yalth was left with a glossy tail-feather in his fingers. He did not know, of course, what had brought the Raven into the tent, but like all misers he was afraid that he was in danger of losing his treasures. So he sent orders

throughout his village that any large black bird that was seen was to be killed instantly, and he kept the sun, the moon and the stars closer than ever. He enjoyed them now in secret, carefully fastening the flap of his tent before he opened either box or bag and forbidding anyone to enter on pain of death. In secret he gloated more than ever over his blazing sun, his silver-glowing moon and his sparkling stars, and he cherished them all the more because he feared that he might lose them.

But the Raven, going about the earth and seeing the famished Indians shuddering in the dark and stretching up their bony hands to the unyielding sky, was more determined than ever to bring them the warm sun for their well-being and the moon and stars for their delight. He said nothing to them but he schemed both night and day.

At last he hit upon a plan and he lost no time in returning to the village of Nass-shig-ee-yalth. A band of boys playing in the woods saw the Raven appear and remembering the Great Chief's command they shouted and fell upon the bird with sticks and stones. Sorely hurt, the Raven managed to struggle into the topmost branches of a lofty pine tree. Two of the boys began swarming up the tree, while the others kept watch, ready to fling stones if he should take to the wing. But before they could reach him the Raven had vanished. He had turned himself into a pine needle.

The boys were dumbfounded and they were more frightened when they realized that in their chase through the forest they had come to the forbidden spring, where none might drink but the daughter of the Great Chief. With swift glances at the pine tree and at the spring which bubbled up from its roots, the boys ran away. They agreed among themselves to say nothing about the black bird, for fear of being punished.

Now the cunning Raven, for all he was a pine needle clinging to a limb of the tall tree in the forest, could still see, and he kept watch for the daughter of Nass-shig-ee-yalth.

Late in the day she came, with her companions. They had been picking berries all day and they were weary and thirsty. They all threw themselves down on the ground whilst the daughter of the Great Chief knelt to drink at the spring. At that moment, the Raven freed himself from his twig and let himself fall into the water. In her hurry to quench her thirst, the princess scooped up the pine needle in her hand and swallowed it with the cool water. But she did not know that she had swallowed a pine needle and she knew nothing of the Good Spirit who had schemed to save mankind.

The daughter of Nass-shig-ee-yalth went home to her father's tent and in the course of time she fell ill and gave birth to a child. It was a little brown Indian boy and it was received with rejoicing in the tents of the Great Chief. But no one knew that it was the Raven, who had turned himself into a pine needle and had now become the grandson of Nass-shig-ee-yalth in order to steal the sun for the poor mortals who crouched in darkness.

The proud grandfather gave a feast to all his friends. In a burst of vanity and generosity, he hung up both the sun and the moon on poles outside his teepee and the braves and squaws danced all night, with faces shining as never before, and their long black shadows danced violently with them to the steady thump of the tom-toms. It was then that the Indians crawling about the earth saw light for the first time. In the remote distance it flickered against the heavy pall of the sky, as frail and elusive as the northern lights when they shine but dimly. At first the Indians were aghast and they fell on their faces in terror, but after a time they took courage and sat peering at the ghostly movement on the sky, murmuring among themselves and hoping for new wonders.

"The meaning of it," said one of their medicine men, "is that the heaven is moving. It is loosening. The sky will gape open and more food will fall down upon us."

"We shall eat! We shall eat!" cried the Indians, and they began to dance for joy. But they soon fell down exhausted.

Nass-shig-ee-yalth took down the sun and laid it carefully in the gilded box, and he took down the moon and stowed it away in the silver box. He put the lids on and fastened them, and all this before he thought of sleep. Thus the light vanished and the poor Indians, when they saw it die out of the sky, sank down in bitter despair.

But the Raven had not forgotten them. He grew quickly and was soon a sturdy lad running about his grandfather's tent and playing games in the woods with the other children. Nass-shig-ee-yalth was proud of him and loved him next to the sun and the moon.

"What is it that you keep in that beautiful glittering bag, grandfather?" asked the Raven one day, when the old chief sat stroking his hair.

Nass-shig-ee-yalth took the little boy's face in his hands and looked into his dark eyes. But he could read nothing there of the cunning of the Raven.

"What makes you ask, my boy?"

"Because the bag shines so, grandfather. I can see it hanging in the dark."

Said the Great Chief: "It is a mighty secret, son." He drew the boy close to him and whispered in his ear: "I have the stars in that bag!"

But the clever Raven pretended that he did not understand, so Nass-shig-ee-yalth lifted down the bag and unfastened the string that bound it.

"Hold out your two hands," he invited. The boy cupped his small brown palms together and held them out and the grandfather filled them with stars. They were heavy and warm, and how they glittered and sparkled! The Great Chief laughed to see the look of astonishment and delight on the

boy's lit face, and he poured out the stars until they brimmed over and fell to the ground.

Thereafter, the Raven was allowed to play with the stars, and he was always careful of them, as he kneeled on the ground and fashioned them into scintillating designs, such as circles and triangles and the shapes of men and deer. He set them out in rows, too, and rolled them about, playing games with them, as if they were common marbles instead of the brilliant stars of heaven. Whenever he was weary of his play, he gathered them up and counted them one by one into the bag, and Nass-shig-ee-yalth watched with his sharp eyes to see that none was lost.

All this time, the Raven was plotting to steal the stars, for while he had the body of a little Indian boy, he was still the Raven, and he still bore in his heart the picture of the poor earthly mortals engulfed in the fathomless dark.

So one night, when the Great Chief was asleep in his teepee, and the Great Chief's daughter was fast in slumber, the little grandson wriggled out of his blankets and stole softly to where the bag of stars was hanging. Without a sound, he unfastened the bag and took it down. He let it sink to the ground, for it was heavy, and crouched, with ears strained to catch the faintest sound. He tip-toed to the flap of the teepee and pulled it back and crawled out. All was dark and still in the camp. Moving as stealthily as a shadow, he laid hold of the bag of stars and dragged it out. No sooner was he in the open than he stretched out his arms and rose on his toes and changed himself back into his own shape. In his beak he clutched the precious burden firmly, and with one sweep of his mighty black wings, the Raven soared into the night sky.

Higher, higher and higher soared the Raven, until he was miles and leagues above the dark earth. Suddenly he opened his bill. The bag fell and dropped like a plummet. In its swiftness it burst and showered the sky with stars. They fell

in a golden hail-storm and as they fell each star burst and was scattered in a thousand smaller stars, until the whole heaven was overspread with them. The sky that had been black was now glittering from end to end with millions of stars shooting and bursting like rockets.

The Indians, frightened out of their wits, ran hither and thither, and threw themselves on their faces. Some of them dashed into the sea and were drowned; some frantically began clawing up the earth with their fingers so as to bury themselves. When some of them had regained their courage, they cast terrified glances at the sky, and then, hidden in the trees, stared outright at it.

But the stars did not fall on them, for so high was the Raven when he dropped the bag that, when they stopped falling, the stars remained hanging in the sky.

"Have no fear," said the medicine men. "The Spirits have riddled the sky with holes and soon it will be torn asunder. Then will the food fall through to us."

For days and nights the Indians gazed up at the starry sky in wonder and awe. No food fell down out of heaven but they got comfort out of simply staring at the stars and inventing stories about the strange patterns they made in silver across the great spread of darkness.

In the meantime, the Raven flew down to the village of Nass-shig-ee-yalth and when he lighted in front of the Great Chief's wigwam he changed as quickly as his feet touched the ground into the form of the little grandson again. Without the slightest sound, he crept into the tent and crawled into his blankets.

He pretended to be asleep. Of a sudden, he screamed. His mother, startled, jumped up and ran to him, with his grandfather at her heels.

"What ails you, little son?" asked the chief's daughter,

clasping the child to her breast and stroking his hair soothingly. The boy cried and could not answer.

"He has been dreaming," grunted Nass-shig-ee-yalth.

When he had been quietened at last, the little boy, the cunning Raven, sobbed out his story.

"I was lying asleep," he said, "when I was awakened by a noise like the rushing wind."

"Dreams," soothed the mother; "it is a still night, and your grandfather and I were asleep until we heard you call."

"It was like the roar of wind and thunder," said the child. "I was terribly afraid. Suddenly the teepee opened at the top and the whole thing fell down."

"The teepee stands whole," said Nass-shig-ee-yalth. "See for yourself, little grandson. You have been having a nightmare."

"A great black bird with widespread wings that seemed to fill the sky came in."

The Great Chief frowned and listened intently.

"He snatched the bag of stars with his beak and flew away. I could not stop him. I was so frightened I could not move. Then I screamed."

The boy began crying afresh and his mother could not comfort him.

"The stars are gone, the stars are gone!" he cried.

"No, no," said the Great Chief's daughter. "It was all a dream. See, your grandfather will bring the stars to you again."

Nass-shig-ee-yalth strode across the floor of the tent to the pole where the bag of stars had hung. He started back in astonishment. The bag was gone. He shouted and began a frantic search. The mother watched him, amazed, and the child went on weeping.

In consternation, the Great Chief roused the whole village and had torches lit and had every man, woman and child scatter

abroad in the search. "Tear up every bush!" he commanded. "Cut down every tree! Leave no stone unturned! Burn the grass! Drain the rivers dry!"

The hunt went on in great excitement, while the Raven cried bitterly, as if he had lost the thing nearest his heart instead of gaining it, and the Great Chief stormed up and down.

At last, a boy, happening to look up instead of down, spied the stars ranged in splendor far aloft above the tent-poles, and called out for all to look. The searchers stopped and stared up into the sky and Nass-shig-ee-yalth came out and stood with folded arms and stared up into the sky with a heavy frown on his face which soon turned into a contortion of rage. Hearing the tumult, the little grandson ran out of the teepee and stretched up his hands and jumped, and when he found he could not reach the stars, cried louder than ever. But all the time, he was laughing in his Raven heart.

The Great Chief ordered the tallest trees to be climbed—for they had not all been cut down—but even the longest arm, thrusting out the longest pole, from the top of the tallest tree, could not touch the nearest star. Nass-shig-ee-yalth marched into his teepee and there he drew his blanket around him and sat glowering and sulking for hours. He sent out orders that the closest watch was to be kept about the village and commanded that if the great black bird appeared again and was allowed to escape every man on guard was to be tied to a tree and made to bristle with arrows as a porcupine with quills.

In time the Raven ceased his weeping, but he refused to eat and fell thin and looked so peaked and sorrowful that his mother's heart was wrung to see him and she entreated the Great Chief to give him something else to play with.

But Nass-shig-ee-yalth was afraid of losing his other treasures, so his heart was stone.

"Have pity!" cried the mother. "It was not the child's

fault that the stars were stolen! Would you see him die of longing? Lift the lid of the silver box and let him look at the moon!"

"No," said the chief.

"One look will not harm the moon," pleaded the mother.

"No."

"Are you afraid of a bird? Get your medicine men, get your bravest fighters, your most powerful magic, your strongest arms and your sharpest arrows, and hedge the moon about with them. Then lift the lid yourself. I will answer for the moon with my life. Can't you see that the child is dying?"

In the end, the stubborn chief relented. He summoned his braves and his medicine men, and they came with their bows and arrows and their tomahawks and their rattles and their charms, they came in their paint and they came in their beads, and they all wore terrible frowns, for they were afraid and they knew not what to do. While they stood in a solid body-guard, the braves with tight lips and the priests with mouths muttering, the Great Chief dragged out the silver box and lifted the lid. The light of the moon burst out of the box and rose like a cloud, flooding the teepee with glory, and the little grandson laughed and clapped his hands and danced up and down with joy. The moon lay at the bottom of the chest like an immense round shield, cool but burnished and shining with a great shine.

"You see how it cheers him?" said the mother, glancing fondly at the boy. "He will not die now."

They could not tear the grandson away from the moon. He crouched before it, gazing at it and stroking it and patting it with his hands. The medicine men and the braves grew weary standing. The braves pressed their lips tighter together and shifted from one foot to the other, and the medicine men muttered louder and invented a curse against all birds, so that they could chant it and relieve their feelings. All the while,

the Raven was scheming in his heart a plan to steal the moon, for he did not think that the stars were enough light for mankind. But he knew that his task would be much harder now. At last, he fell asleep and was carried off to bed. The medicine men and the braves were released and a second shift was brought in to take their places guarding the moon; and the sun as well, of course.

As the days passed by and there was no sign of the Raven, vigilance relaxed a little and the grandson was allowed to take the moon out of the box and trundle it about like a wheel. But wherever he went, there were strong, swift men with him to keep watch.

To fly with the moon was impossible. If he turned into his own form he would have to do so before the eyes of the bodyguard, and even if he escaped the swift arrows, he would never be able to come back for the sun. And the Raven had made up his mind that he would bring sun, moon and stars to the Indians. So the Raven ran up and down with the shining moon every day, rolling it before him and having the braves roll it back to him, and spinning it, and, every moment as he played, trying to think of a way to hoodwink the swift, strong men with the keen eyes. At last he hit upon a plan.

He tried to toss the moon into the air one day when he was out in the woods, but could not, for he was too small, so he laughed and said: "Which of you can throw the farthest?"

The braves looked at one another and said they would not throw. The Raven then taunted them, until one of the men stepped proudly forward and without a word took the moon in his hand and swung his arm in a wide circle. The moon left his fingers and soared into the air, spinning and flashing with silver radiance. High above the treetops it flew. It seemed to hang a moment before it curved and plunged down to earth again.

The Raven laughed and clapped his hands and said: "No

one can beat that! None of you can throw higher than that! Toss it again!"

But another brave strode out and picked up the moon. He was a great braggart and he swaggered as he lifted the moon, and nodded his head and leered, as if to say, "Watch me!" He held the moon in his curved fingers and crouched like a discus thrower. He held his breath and strained all the muscles of his body so tensely that the sweat stood shining on his forehead. The other braves smiled to themselves. With a mighty effort, the braggart lunged into the air and heaved the moon above his head. He fell back on the ground but the moon sailed up, up and up, dizzily spinning and casting off a rapidly flickering light.

Rising to his feet, the braggart grinned in vanity at the astonishment of the other strong men, for the moon was far beyond the tips of the loftiest trees and was still flying. The higher it rose, the brighter was the light it shed. The thrower's triumph was turned to consternation, and when he saw that the moon would not come down again, he threw himself on the ground in terror. He would have fled, but the braves marched up to him grimly and fastened their fingers on his arms and shoulders. The Raven, pretending once more to be stricken with grief, was weeping as though his heart would break.

But the poor mortal Indians saw the moon rise out of the earth and swing higher and higher into the starry heaven and they shouted with delight. They watched it soar and looked for it to burst into a thousand stars, but it dimmed the sparkle of the stars by its own enchantment and filled all the earth with a soft silvery glow as it slowly climbed the sky, circled across it and sank steadily down to the earth again on the other side.

The Indians then wept and lamented, but next night the moon appeared again, and night after night thereafter, for so strong was the arm of the braggart—or so great the magic

of the Raven—that the moon never stopped but kept on going round and round the earth forever.

But the braggart, because he had lost the moon, was dragged before Nass-shig-ee-yalth, cowering in fear, and he was judged and afterwards struck down by a tomahawk and killed.

In the light of the moon, the Indians discovered the wild animals who had themselves come out of their dens to see the wonders, and learned how to sharpen stones and make weapons to hunt down the beasts and kill them. Thus they got meat, but they had no fire, so ate it raw.

It was the crafty Raven's ambition to bring them the sun, as he had brought them the stars and the moon, and he set about his purpose by crying and falling ill because he no longer had his moon for a plaything. In the end, the Great Chief could not refuse him, but he would not let the boy take the sun out of the box.

"I have lost my stars and I have lost my moon," he said. "Must I lose the greatest treasure of all, my sun? How is it that we, the Great People, have been able to live in comfort, while the Indians in the darkness starved and perished of cold? The insignificant mortals grovel in holes in the ground and chew roots and bark, while we dwell in tents and build fires and eat good meat. Why is this? Because we have had the light. Even when I kept the sun and the moon sealed up in my chests, we had light throughout our village and in all our woods, so powerful was the magic of my treasures. Now the stars are out of reach and the moon has gone rolling up the sky! The miserable Indians are now greedily devouring my light and soon I shall have none left. If they get my sun, we shall be no better off than they are. Instead of owning it, we shall have to share it. They will be as happy and as strong as we are. They may even sweep down upon us and destroy us!"

So the Great Chief would lift the lid of the sun box and

allow the grandson to peep in at the magnificent ball of fire, but no more. And he called upon his medicine men to weave strange dances round and round the box. With long feathers in their hair and hideous masks on their faces and paint on their wrists and arms and legs, with strings of beads and quills around their necks, and with rattles in their bony fingers, they shuffled back and forward, round and round, writhing and chanting, and doing their best to keep the sun safe for the Great Chief. But their medicine was of no avail against the medicine of the Raven.

He was not now afraid to reveal himself, for if he could escape with the sun he would have all he wanted. To get the sun he would have to make a bold stroke. After thinking about it long and intently, he ran out into the woods, transformed himself into his own shape and spread his wings for all the village to see. The village sprang alive with scurry and shout; the braves grasped their bows and the urchins picked up sticks and stones; the Great Chief hurried out and the medicine men emerged and ranged themselves in line, calling down blood-curdling curses on the great black bird soaring overhead. The Raven flew off toward the North and the village poured pell-mell after him. Suddenly the Raven dropped down and, while the braves were beating the woods frantically to corner him, changed into the shape of the grandson again. So intent was everyone on the hunt that no one noticed the little boy dodging through the woods and darting back to the teepee.

He burst into the deserted tent of Nass-shig-ee-yalth and without stopping for breath tugged at the golden chest and pried off the lid. The sun lay in the box like a ball of soft gold. The Raven did not stop to admire it. By dint of great labor, for he was only a small boy, with short, puny arms, he managed to overturn the box and dump the sun out on the earth. The great globe, blazing with such a light that it almost

blinded him, rolled out of the teepee, and he ran after it, trembling with fear that he might lose it or that the villagers might see the light. What to do with the sun now that he had it, the Raven did not know. As a little Indian boy he could not carry it in his arms or upon his back; if he transformed himself into his own shape he could not fly with the enormous burden of the round, burning sun. Because it was so heavy, it rolled only a few yards away, and there it lay on the earth between two teepees.

The glory of its light poured out and deluged the village and all the woods around, and the Great Chief and the braves, the medicine men, the squaws and the little children stopped in their tracks and then, at a hoarse word, began running head-long back to the teepees.

The Raven heard the shouts and his heart stopped in his breast, but he quickly overcame his fright and found his voice. He stood over the sun and cried: "Fly, Sun, fly!" He glanced up and saw that three braves, panting and sweating and grasping their tomahawks until their knuckles were white, were tearing through the woods. "Sun, Sun, Sun!" the Raven sang, clenching his hands and pressing his heels into the ground. "No clod of earth are you! Break loose, leap up and fly!" One of the braves stumbled and one turned quickly to lift him, but the third ran on. Closer and closer he pressed to where the Great Chief's little grandson, to where the Raven stood singing frantically to the burning sun. Behind the three braves, coming more slowly but coming relentlessly, crowded Nass-shig-ee-yalth and the whole village. The Raven, with his body as taut as a bowstring straining against an arrow, swayed backwards and forwards over the sun and stretched his tense fingers down to it and then suddenly relaxed and threw back his head and gazed into the sky. "Sun! Sun! Sun!" he shouted. "No frozen stone are you! Break loose, leap up and fly!" The sun seemed to shift and begin to revolve slowly

as his voice rose. The braves pushed forward ruthlessly, for they could see that the little grandson was trying to weave magic about the sun. But they dare not throw their tomahawks at him, for he was the grandson of Nass-shig-ee-yalth and they were afraid to shed his blood.

Rapidly and more rapidly, so that his words seemed to be lost in a spinning of sound, sang the Raven, imploring the sun to launch itself into the sky, calling upon the ball of fire to leap up and swerve high over the village, to soar up and up out of reach, as the moon had soared. The sun moved. Slowly it began to rise from the ground. The Raven sang with never a pause for breath. Time seemed to stop, and the braves, while they forced their way relentlessly forward, seemed to come not a step nearer. The Raven sang of the dolorous Indians huddling cold in the dark and called upon the sun to shower its mercy upon them. He sang of the glorious expanse of heaven where the sun could rove, no longer kept shut up in a box to be brought out at the behest and the whim of a vain and avaricious man. He sang and beat his hands in rhythm. He sang and swayed his body in rhythm. Slowly, steadily, the sun floated up. It rose above the teepee tops. It rose above the tree tops.

As if suddenly jerked out of a spell, the braves shouted and the medicine men screamed. Nass-shig-ee-yalth groaned and cried out: "Kill the boy! He is no son of mine! He is a devil, he is a devil! Kill him and bring me back my sun!" But the Raven went on singing and swaying, exulting in his heart. The Great Chief rushed forward to strike him down but the Great Chief's daughter clutched his arm and held him back. A tomahawk flew over the Raven's head and sank shivering into a tree trunk. Panting and sweating, two braves fell upon the Raven and the villagers pressed in around them. The Raven laughed and shouted. The floating sun leapt in the air as if it were a stone flung from a sling. The Raven shouted

again and the sun shot up like a rocket, like a comet, leaving a train of sparks behind it.

The braves fastened their hands on the little Indian boy and Nass-shig-ee-yalth, shaking free from the mother, strode forward, his face black with anger. But just as they touched him, he was a little Indian boy no longer. In their hands, as quick as a dart of lightning, he changed into his own shape. His black wings beat in their faces. He shook his feathers and plunged into the air. The braves fell back, affrighted. All the villagers cried out in surprise and alarm, and by the time their wits came back to them and they understood the Great Chief's shouts and began shooting with their arrows and hurtling stones and tomahawks into the air, the Raven was far out of reach. Before the eyes of Nass-shig-ee-yalth and his braves and medicine men, the sun climbed higher and higher, dwindling, shrinking, until it was no more than a bright jewel glittering in the sky. The Raven appeared in the light for a moment, like a black speck, so high had he soared, and then, in a twinkling, he vanished.

So it was the Raven charmed the sun away from the miser Nass-shig-ee-yalth for the welfare of the whole world. The Indians squatting and trembling by the sea were amazed when the sun rose upon them for the first time. Brighter far than the moon, brighter than the stars, it wiped out both moon and stars. In its glory it swallowed them. The sky was suffused with blue. The sea shone and sparkled. The green grass pushed up through the black earth. The withered trees felt the sap running through their veins and trembled and burst like song into green leaf. The flowers showered the earth with colour and sweetened the air with perfume. For the first time, the Indians saw their own faces in the full light. They laughed and danced and sang. They were no longer cold. No longer were they blind. With the heat of the sun they struck fire. The poor mortals were wretched no more. They began at last

to live. When the sun disappeared at night, they lamented, but they had the moon and the stars for their consolation and they were weary with finding life, so they slept; and when they awakened again the sun swung round the earth and lighted them to fresh joy. Day in and day out, the sun circled the heaven and served them with warmth and light, and the earth burgeoned for them, and the Raven who stole for them the moon, the sun and the stars, lived throughout history and for all time in their tales.

A SIXTEENTH CENTURY BLACK LIST

BY E. C. KYTE

IN the Bodleian Library at Oxford is a small book which merits the close attention of any who take an interest in the social condition of bygone England. It is entitled *A Caveat for Common Cursetors, vulgarly called Vagabones, set forth by Thomas Harman Esquiere, for the utilite and proffyt of his naturall Countrey;* the date is 1567. The title page also bears a rudely executed wood cut, wherein two "vagabones" are being whipped at the cart's tail, to the great apparent delight of the cart horse and of a small dog running beside.

By the dedication (to "the ryght honorable and my singular good lady, Elizabeth, Countess of Shrewsbury") we gather that the said Thomas Harman "being placed as a poor gentleman, have kept a house these twenty years, whereunto poverty dayely hath and doth repayre, not without some reliefe, as my poor calling and habyltye maye and doth extend; I have of late years gathered a great suspition that all should not be well, and as the proverb saythe 'sume thing lurk and lay hid that dyd not playnely appear', for I having more occation throughe sickenes, to tarry and remain at home, do by my there abyding talke and confere dayly with many of these wyly wanderaars of both sortes, as well men and wemmen as boys and gyrles, by whom I have gathered and understande their depe dissimulation and detestable dealyng, being marvelous suttile and craftye in there kynde." Briefly, Thomas Harman discovered that for twenty years his charity had been much imposed upon by mendicants—men whose poverty was caused by a disinclination for work, and whose honesty was only measured by their opportunities for dishonesty. Thus becom-

ing indirectly aware of the numbers whose mission in life it was to prey upon their fellows, and not desiring that the process should be repeated and extended indefinitely, he was moved to draw up and publish an indictment against "this rousey, ragged rabblement of rakehelles", "these pevysh perverse and pestilent people", "these wretched wily, wandering vagabones", as he calls them with plentiful alliteration.

The gain to be gathered from "the confusion of the drowsey demener and unlawfull language, pylfring picking, wily wanderinge and lykinge lechery of all these rablement of rascals" was certainly very great. Constables, Bayliffes and "bosholders" (query, householders) would become more circumspect; and then!—"Then will no more this rascall rablement range about the countrey. Then shall we kepe our Horses in our pastures unstolen." (This was a sore point—a rueful note in the body of the book says "I had the best geldinge stolen out of my pasture that I had amongst others whyle this book was first a printinge") "Then our lynnens clothes shall and may lye safely on our hedges untouched. Then shall we not have our clothes and lynnens hoked out at our wyndowes as well by day as by night. Then shall we not have our houses broken up in the night, as of late one of my nyghtbors had, and two great buckes of clothes stolen out and most of the same fyne Lynnens. Then shall we safely kepe our pigges and poultreys from pylfring. Then shall we surely pass by the hygh waies leading to markets and fayres unharmed. Then shall our Shopes and bothes be unpycked and spoyled. Then shall these uncomly companies be dispersed and set to labour for their lyvinge, or hastily hang for their demerits." With many more advantages, culminating in "the inestimable joye and comfort of the Quenes most excelent maiestye."

The need for such a book was manifest, and its success great. The Bodleian copy is a second edition, or "impression," as Harman said; and the original issue was probably in the

previous year (1566). The third edition appeared in 1568 and the fourth in 1573. Whether it had the effect intended cannot be known; at least its author achieved some part of his object; for he set out fully the names and methods of all the "Upright Men, Roges and Pallyards" with whom he was acquainted, and in addition a general description of their tricks, which must have proved most effectual in forewarning the credulous citizen. The book was, in effect, a "black list" for the home counties, and its author had before him the results that "wholsome lawes and the due execution thereof" had achieved in the case of the "Egyptians"—the gypsies—a few years previously. These "vagabonds—depely dissembling and long hyding and covering their depe deceitfull practises—feeding the rude common people, wholly addicted and given to novelties, toyes and new inventions" (can this be an accurate description of the proletariat in those spacious times?), "de-lyting them with the strangenes of the attyre of their heades, and practising paulmistre . . ."—these had been "all dispersed, banished and the memory of them cleane extyngnished." Which fortune the author hopes may follow his own efforts.

Apparently the first edition met with some criticisms; for in the Epistle to the Reader which prefaces this second impression Harman defends his use of the term Cursetors—"a greate fault as some take it, but none as I meane it." He derived it from *curro* and held it to signify runners or rangers about the country; and, he protests, "iff I should have used such wordes as this realme used in Kynge Henry the thyrd or Edwarde fyrstes tyme, oh, what a grose barberous fellow have we here! his wryting is both homely and darke, that we had nede to have an interpretar! yet then it was very well, and in short season a great change we see." The preface concludes with the statement that he neither deserves blame nor desires praise; having written "faithfullye for the proffyt and benyfyte of my countrey."

His first care is to describe the various grades of this strange fraternity; which is done in order of demerit. Strangely enough we find no mention of any such organization of mendicants as existed in later days when Bampfylde Moore Carew styled himself "King of the Beggars." Harman's Rufflers, Roges, and Priggers owned to no community of interests and were subject to no law but that of self-preservation and selfishness. There were certain habitations such as the King's Barn "betwene Deptford and Rothered" (?Rotherhithe), and Kidbroke near Blackheath, where gangs and individuals herded, when their wanderings reached the locality; there were also various houses about the country "especially for that purpose, where they shall be better welcome than honest men": yet such congregations were but a 'fortuitous concourse of atoms' at the 'Travellers' Club of that day. What pre-eminence existed was exercised by the "Upright men"—in Harman's list second to the Rufflers, who formed a kind of aristocracy as having once been honest men. The individual ruffler, whom Harman calls "the first in degre of this odious order", "the worthiest of this unruly rablement", had either served in the wars or been a serving man; usually the latter, thinks our author, for "souldiers . . . (if) they escape all hassardes and return home again, if they bee without reliefe of their friends, they wyl surely desparatly robbe and steale, and eyther shortlye be hanged or misarably dye in prison. Now these Rufflars, the outcastes of serving men, when begginge or craving fayles (fails), then they pycke and pylfer from other inferiour beggeres that they meete by the way, as Roages, Pallyardes, Mortes and Doxes." Honour among thieves was a proverb unhonoured in England at this time. Harman tells of an old man, a tenant of his, who was coming homeward on "blacke heathe, at the end thereof next to shotars hyl" (Shooters Hill) and overtook two rufflars "the one mannerly wayting on the other, as one had been the master and the other the man

or servant, caryinge his maister's cloak." He was very glad of their company over the hill, it being a notorious resort of thieves, and he having in his purse the sum of seven shillings—"and an olde angell, which this poor man had thought had not bene in his purse for hee wyllled his wyfe over night to take out the same—which indede forgot to do it." They rode on together, wolves and lamb in company; but very soon "after salutations" came the demand "stand and deliver." Enjoined to "confess truely" what money was in his purse "this poore man, then all abashed, yielded, and confessed that he had but just seven shyllinges in his purse; and the trouth is he knew of no more. Now this seven shyllinges in whyte money they quickly founde, thinkinge in dede there had been no more; yet farther gropinge and searchinge found this old angell. And with great admiration this gentleman thyefe began to blesse hym sayinge 'good lord what a worlde is this! howe maye' (quoth hee) 'a man beleve or truste in the same? se you not' (quoth hee) 'this old knave told mee that he had but seven shyllinges and here is more by an angell: what an old knave and a false knave have we here', quoth this rufflar; 'oure lorde have mercy on us, wyll this worlde never be better?'—and there with went their waye."

The ruffler was indeed a forerunner of the Dick Turpins and Macheaths of a later generation—"a gentleman thief," and as such took first rank among his fellows. However, "These rufflars," says Harman, "after a yeare or two at the farthest, become upright men, unless they be prevented by twind hempe." The transition was from amateur to professional, and the upright man was in many respects a beggar rather than a highwayman. He had probably been an artificer or labouring man trained up in husbandry, who was "not mindinge to get his livinge with the swete of his face" and therefore wandered at will through "the most shires of this realm." It is instructive to note that the counties which

Harman says were "the cheyfe and best shyres of reliefe" are contained in a triangle having its most northerly point in Norfolk and its westerly in Somerset. Whether the inhabitants north of the Trent were too poor or too shrewd for a vagabond's liking may be left to conjecture.

The upright men—"these unrewly rascals—disperse themselves into severall companies, sometyme more and sometyme lesse. As if they repayre to a poore husbandman's house hee wyll go alone or one with hym and stoutely demaund his charytie, eyther shewing how he hath served in the warres and their (was) maymed, eyther that he sekethe service, and saythe that he would be glad to take payne for his lyvinge, althoughe he meaneth nothings lesse. Yf he be offered any meate or drinke he utterly refuseth scornfully, and wyll nought but money; and yf he espye yong pyges or pultry, he well noteth the place, and they (then?) the next night or shortly after hee wyll be sure to have some of them."

Harman gives a long description of the meetings of these men in the certain low ale houses at which they were welcome. There they came with their Mortes and Doxes—the females with whom their fortunes were shared—and then, "At these foresayde peltinge pevish places and unmannerly meetings, O! how the pottes walke about! their talkinge tounge talke at large. They bowle and bowse one to another." Yet if there was not honour among thieves there was at least dignity; "These upright men stand so much upon their reputation as they wyll in no case have their wemen walk with them." "They have been much lately whipped at faires." "They syldome or never passe by a Justices house, but have by-ways, unlesse he dwell alone and but weakely manned." They are "not unprovided with good codgels which they carry to sustaine them, and as they fayne to keepe Dogges from them, when they come to such good gentlemens houses." Sometimes they make night excursions and then "as the wyly foxe crepinge

out of his den, seketh his praye for pultrey so do these for lynnenn and anythings els worth money and in the night time carye the same lyke good water spanlles to their foresayd houses." Here the receiver or "fence" was waiting to pick out the marks and convey the good far off, to sell. Alibis, beloved of Mr. Weller, senior, were easily had, for if it fortuneth that any one of these upright men should be taken or suspected "he wyll say that he was in his hostes house. . . And . . . they boldly vouch that they lodged hym such a tyme—whereby the truth cannot appear." The upright man also exercised the right of initiating his lesser brethren in to the Canting trade—taking money of course for his services—twenty pence or two shillings. The ceremony consisted in calling for a "gage of bouse, which is a quart pot of drink," pouring the same upon the novice's "peld pate," and remarking "I, G. P., do stalle the, W. T. to the Roge, and from henceforth it shalle be lawful for the to Cant for thy living in all places." "Here may you se that the upright man is of great auctorite. For all sorts of beggars are obedient to hys hests, and surmounteth all others in pylfiring and stealinge."

The next worthy in this black list is given as the Hoker or Angglear. "Peryllous and most wicked knaves," Harman calls them, and adds a touch of personal description—"they comenly go in frese jerkynes and gally slopes" (wide loose trousers) "poynted benethe the kne." The Hookers worked by night; they "customably carry with them a staff of V or VI foote long in which, within one inch of the tope thereof is a lytle hole bored through in which they put an yron hoke, and with the same they reche ther with." In his begging excursions by day the expert "angler" noted where linen or apparel hung near the windows, and then, coming by night would "convey" (excellent word) the booty to some secure spot; not to the receiver at first, for it was invariably laid by for three days before any attempt

was made to sell it. It is interesting to conjecture that we may here have an atavistic custom with its origin in the savage's desire to keep secret personally acquired property. The men attained a great degree of skill in their work: "I was credibly informed," says Harman, "that a hoker came to a farmer's house in the ded of the night, and putting back a drawe window of a low chamber, the bed standing hard by the said window, in which lay three parsons (persons),—a manne and two bygge boys—this hoker with his staffe plucked off their garments which lay upon them to keepe them warme, with the coverlet and shete and lifte them lying aslepe naked saving their shirtes, and had a way all clene and never could understande where it became" (id est.—they never *could* find out what had happened—poor folks). "I verely suppose that when they were wel waked with cold, they suerly thought that Robin Goodfellow (accordinge to the old saying) had bene with them that night."

Next to the Hooker came the "Roge"; and next to him the "Wylde Roge"—for our author would make it apparent that there are distinctions in every trade (as between "eggs" and "fresh eggs"). Indeed, the difference in this case was again that of amateur and professional, for while the Rogue had merely taken up the game from an amateur's love of it—and a distaste for honest work; the Wild Rogue "is he that is borne a Roge; he is a more subtil and more geven by nature to all kinde of knavery than the other . . . and from his infancy traded up in treachery." Harman speaks of families where for three generations all the members had been Rogues, and, as his informant remarked "*he* must nedes be one by good reason." No condition in all social England was more hopeless than this of the mendicant by birth; he had not rejected honesty, decency, and hard work—he had never known them.

Somewhat apart from this pedestrian congeries comes The Prygger of Prauncers; a title which would almost recon-

cile one to the thing itself. "Odysseus, Sacker of Cities," was not more dignified, and we may regret that the horse thief of this material age has no such touch of poetry in his calling. The Pryggers "go commonly in Jerkins of leather or of white frese, carry little wands in their hands and will walk through grounds and pastures to search and se horses meete for their purpose. And if they chance to be met and asked by the owners of the grounds what they make there, they fayne strayghte that they have lost their waye and aske to be enstructed the beste waye to such a place. . . These have also there women that walkinge in other places mark where and what they see abroad and sheweth these Priggars thereof when they meete. And loke, when they steale anything they convey the same at the least thre score miles of or more."

Harman tells—not without a suspicion of mirth—of a gentleman, "a verye friende" of his, who entrusted his own horse and that of his servant to one of these Pryggers, to be walked up and down while the two men visited a farm a quarter of a mile away. "This peltynge Priggar, proude of his praye," took full advantage of the opportunity, and when the rightful owner began to inquire for his horses that were walked "the inhabitants 'una voce' said that no such man dwelt in their streate, neither in the parish." At which "I had thoughte," quoth this gentleman, "that he had here dwelled" — and marched home manerly in his botes."

Several of the fellowships given here may be passed over with little mention. Such are the Pallyards, also called Clapperdogens, the Fraters "who carye black boxes at their gyrdel," the Abraham men, who feign themselves to have been mad "and have bene kept eyther in Bethelem (Bedlam) or in some other pryson a good tyme." Of the latter order "one naminge himself Stradlynge is the craftiest and moste dyssemblingest knave of all that ever I saw." "He sayeth that he was the Lord Sturton's man" and lost his wits upon that

nobleman's execution; "and with the very grief and feare he was taken with a marvelous palsey, that both head and hands will shake when he talketh with anye, and that apase or fast whereby he is much pitied and getteth greatly. And if I had not demanded of others, that commonly walketh as he doth, and known by them his deepe dissimylation I never hadde understande the same."

An original kind of vagabond was the Whipjacke. "These Freshwater Mariners, their shipes were drowned in the playne of Salisbury. These kinde of Caterpillers counterfet great losses on the sea; these bee some Western men, and most bee Irish men. They come into . . . London and down by the river to seeke for their shyppe and goods that they never hadde; then passe they through Surrey, Sussex, by the sea costes and so into Kent, demanding almes to bring them home to their country."

Among the vagabonds who preyed more directly upon the public the "Counterfet Crankes" were probably the worst. These men simulated "the falling evil" (epileptic fits), and, by way of variety, also pretended to have received wounds in the wars, or to have some hurt which might be evidenced by a plentiful plastering of foul bandages. The manner in which Harman and his friend the printer exposed and confounded the most plausible of these knaves is very pretty reading, but forms too long a narrative for much detail here. The Crank, whose name was Nicolas Genynges (Jennings), first commended himself to our author's suspicions by being evidently anxious to preserve as woe begone an appearance as possible. His face was bloodstained, and his rags covered with mud and dirt; but on being offered water to wash in and "a fayre linnen cloth" he was too apprehensive that he should "fall to bleedinge afresh againe," to spoil anything of the general effect. Indeed, after giving an account of his parentage, birth, misfortunes and confinement in Bedlam, which was found to be untrue in

all particulars, he repaired to the back of Clements Inn "where is a Lane that goeth into the Feldes; there he renewed his face againe withe fresh bloud, which he carried about hym in a bladder, and dawbed on fresh dyrt upon his jerkin, hat and hoson." When this crank came back to the waterside he looked so "ougleie and yrksomlye that every one pitied his miserable case." Therefore, as the two boys who were watching him reported, he had from the pitiful a good deal of money. At nightfall the crank took a boat and crossed over the water to St. George's Fields; but the boys "with Argues and Lynckes eyes set sewre watche upon hym," and while one went back with the news to his master the printer, the other took boat and followed. Having no money to pay for the boat hire, this resourceful youth "layde his Penner and his Ynkhorne to gage for a penny," and then being joined by his master, the two watched their man as far as Newington. There, "as it began to be very darke," and the Printer had not "any kynde of weapon about hym" they called for the Constable, stopped the crank, and gave him in charge "as a malefactor and a dessemblinge vagabonde." The constable kept a "vytellinge house," and thither the prisoner was taken. First they "caused him to washe himselfe; that done they demanded what money he had about hym." He modestly owned to 12 pence "and pluck out the same of a lyttle pursse," swearing strenuous oaths that he had no more. "We must se more," quoth they and began to stryp hym." Then he offered another purse in which was forty pence, praying that he might be "dampned both body and soule" if he had any more. Whereupon he was confronted with the boy who had watched him—and at that he "relented (sic) and plucked out another purse wherein was eight shillinges and od money"; the whole amounting to over thirteen shillings. We are told that they "strypt hym stark naked" *after* this—so it is probable that they set no exaggerated value upon his assurances. When they had thus wrung

water out of a flint, the Printer and the Constable felt on good terms with themselves and sighed for more worlds to conquer. They therefore "devised to search a barne for some roges and upright men, a quarter of a myle from the house," and went, leaving their victim, simply clad in an old cloak, in charge of the constable's wife. "This crafty cranke, espying al gon" made an excuse to open the door for a moment; and thereupon, casting away his garment he fled into the night "and was never heard of again till now," says Harman—that is, up to the time of writing.

Much more of interest may be found in this quaint old book; but the exploits of others in that strange fellowship would extend this article unduly. Therefore I shall pass over the Dommerars, the Dronken Tinckars (called also Prygges), the Swaddlers, Jarkemans, Patricos, etc., together with their attendant females, their Kynchin Mortes, which are little girls, and their Kynchin Cos,—which are "younge boyes." Poor children—"traden up to suche pevish purposes as you have harde of other young ympes before, that when he groweth unto yeres, he is better to hang than to drawe forth."

The list which follows—"The names of the Upright Men, Roges and Pallyards"—is not alphabetical in arrangement, and most of the names mentioned would have little meaning for us. But here and there an illuminative note is appended which adds interest to the bare record. Such is "Dowzabell, skylfull in fence", or "John Louedall, a maister of fence"—old soldiers probably. We find strange appellations, such as "Follentine Hylles" and "Harry Agglyntine"—the surname here is reminiscent of Norman blood, somewhat diluted, such as we find later on in "Wylliam Vmberuile" that is, Umberville. Personal characteristics are often given—as aids to identification:—"Robart Bronswerd, he werith his here long," "Harry Smyth, he driveleth when he speaketh." "Thomas Graye, his toes be gonne." There are two "great stamerars"

—John Browne and Nicholas Adames; while John Donne with one leg, John Crew with one arm, and James Lane with one eye, represent more noticeable imperfections. Richard Hylton “carrieth II Kynchen Mortes about with him”; Wyll Pettyt “beareth a Kinchen Mort at his back”; “Welarayd Richard” was possibly rather more of a Ruffler than an Upright Man. John Horwood and Richard Horwood have etched portraits; the lines well bitten in. John was a maker of wells! “he wyle take halfe his bargayne in hand, when he hath wrought II or III daies he runneth away with his earnest.” Richard was “well nere lxxx yeares olde; he wyll byte a VI peny nayle a sonder with his teeth, and a bawdye dronkard.” There are a number of Irish names in this list and several Welsh; but “Arche Dowglas, a Scot,” appears to be the only man from the northern kingdom. The prejudice against the Scot was little diminished, even in countries to which the moss troopers had never penetrated. It may be that “John Perse, a counterfet cranke,” was a representative of the great Northumbrian family; “Burfet” may be a faint and far off rendering of Bartholomew; “Belberby” is perhaps Belarbre; but what shall one make of “Soth gard” as a name? Among the rogues it is interesting to notice “Humfrey Ward,” and of the Upright Men “John a Pycons” is etymologically curious.

To round off his book Harman introduces a glossary of the terms used by beggars—“the language of these lewtering Lusks and lasy Lorrels . . . Whych language they term Peddlars French, an unknown tongue only but to these bold beastly bawdy Beggars and vaine Vagabondes.” From it we learn that the cursetors employed a kind of realistic symbolism—a picture language. A man’s house was his “Ken,” fire was “glymmar,” a bed “lybbege.” Animals were mostly rendered by the onomatopoeic method—thus a cow was “a lowinge chete,” a sheep “a bleteinge chete”, a cock or capon “a cackling chete,” a duck “a quakinge chete.” A pig was “a gruntinge

chete," but was also called "a patrico's kynchen"—a priest's child—for reasons not hard to discover. There was a touch of genius when some one called the hen "a margery prater," and "poppelar" for porridge is expressive. Bacon is "ruf pek," bread "pannam" and cheese "cassan" (a glimpse of French in both these names.) Clothes are "dudes," a cap "a nabchet—"nab" being a head; to open the door is "to dup the gyger," and to lie down to sleep is "to couch a hogshead." Harman's own spelling is at times delightfully quaint; as when he explains that the cant words "to heue a bough" mean "to robbe or rifle a boeweth." One hardly knows which equivalent to our modern "booth" is the more worthy of admiration.

Perhaps our author considered that words alone were inadequate to draw the moral from such a story of accumulated roguery. At the end of the book are several illustrations, conveying to the reader a sense of the inevitable end at which these errant knights arrived. There are the stocks—with two men fast therein; chains and gyves; long birch rods, and whips with four thick knotted thongs apparently of leather. These culminate in a picture of the gallows. A broken rope dangles from the beam—perhaps an indication that its latest victim was but recently cut down—and below stands the pinioned cursetor, at the end of his journeys. From that gibbet there was no appeal—it was almost in the natural order of things that the beggar *should* so die; and the "new lawes" which Harman in his preface triumphantly cites were destined to indicate death as clearly as did ever the blue mists which rise in the Roman Campagna.

If anything could relieve the grimness of this scene it would be the verses appended. We may judge that the writer sought first for moral effect; there is about them a complacency, a sense that the conventions have been vindicated—such as may inflate some super letting fall the curtain upon the melodrama's final scene. Certainly a simile of the stage entered

Harman's mind; his thief is made to speak of "now piteously playing this tragical part." "O! dolful daye, now death draweth nere, His bitter sting doth perce me to the heart." So he commences that "last dying speech and confession" which would be sold outside Newgate walls even before its subject's life was ended.

Two other of these concluding verses remain to be quoted. Below the picture of the lash is written:—

"A whyp is a whysker that wyll wrest out blood
Of back and of body beaten right well.
Of all the other it doth the most good
Experience techeth and they can well tell."

Note the masterly suggestiveness of the last line. "They" were best able to give eloquent testimony to the merits of "whyskers"; experience had taught. The author has an appearance of either pursuing his ancient grudge against these creatures or of using them as mimes whereby his book may be rounded off. Especially does this appear in his closing words:

"Here I conclude my bolde beggars booke
That all estates most planely maye see
As in a glass well pollyshed to looke
Their double demeaner in eache degree
Their lyves, their language, their names as they be.
That with this warning their myndes may be warned
To amend their mysdeedes and so lyve unharmed."

It would be easy to write at greater length of this strange work. The success attending its publication was so great that two printers "pirated" it—doubtless from philanthropic motives—and were most properly fined.

Of Harman's life we know very little; neither his birth nor death find place in our records: and although the craving for memoirs is not necessarily worthy of encouragement, we

must feel that something is lost through our ignorance of more intimate details. He reveals himself in the "Caveat" as one to whom the social life of that day was a drama acted for his benefit; he possessed humour, keen insight and shrewd observation; and had he taken a more prominent part in affairs during those spacious times he might possibly have done for the sixteenth something of that which Samuel Pepys has done for the seventeenth century.

THE WEE BROON MAN

BY ROBERT WATSON

The day grows cauld an' the win' blaws snell;
The whaups by the shore are cryin' sair;
The dark creeps owre the moor an' fell;
The bairns are beddit twa hoors an' mair.
Wheesht! Wheesht! As quiet's ye can;
It's near the time for the *wee broon man*.

For wha dae ye keep the three-legged stool
That nane dare sit on frae morn till nicht,
An' the rug by the fire o' lambs' guid wool;
The glimmerin' peep o' the lantern licht?
Wheesht! Wheesht! As quiet's ye can,
They're there for the use o' the *wee broon man*.

The nicht grows dark an' the win' blaws cauld;
The door should be ticht wi' sneck an' key:
The sheep lie warm within the fauld;
For wha dae ye leave the door agee?
Wheesht! Wheesht! As quiet's ye can,
It's open tae welcome the *wee broon man*.

What gars ye sit roon' the wee stool there,
In your clean bare feet, as the Word is read,
While your faither pits up his lang lang prayer,
Afore ye gang tae your ain wee bed?
Wheesht! Wheesht! As quiet's ye can,
We dae it tae humour the *wee broon man*.

Why mix mair brose a' warm an' new,
An' set it wi' milk on the three-legged stool,
When a' are at hame an' suppert fu',
An' happit snug i' the sheeps' saft wool?

Wheesht! Wheesht! As quiet's ye can,
We daurna forget the *wee broon man*.

There's mornin' licht, an' the day comes fast.

The brose frae the bowl is lickit clean.

The lambs' wool rug is turned and tashed.

I wonder wha i' the nicht has been?

Wheesht! Wheesht! As quiet's ye can,
I'm glad we hae sheltered the *wee broon man*.

An' wha wad want his wee laigh stool,

An' who wad steek the door sae ticht,

An' wha wad forget his bed o' wool,

An' his sup o' brose, an' his peep o' licht?

Wheesht! Wheesht! As quiet's ye can,
For we need the luck o' the *wee broon man*.

POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE LONDON CONFERENCE

BY ROBERT A. MACKEY

A JUDICIAL estimate of the London Conference is possible only if we look at it in a long perspective. To the historian of 1980 the Conference will doubtless appear, not as an isolated event, but as part of the web and woof of international organization which has developed since the war. He will relate the Conference not only to the series of naval conferences which was initiated at Washington in 1922, but also to the League of Nations, the Kellogg Pact, and other agreements for the suppression of war. A half century hence, the figures of tons and guns will have little more than academic interest, while the political facts will still appear significant and the political implications the only important ones. This is the perspective, then, in which the Conference is here examined.

The outstanding achievement is, of course, the Three Power Agreement limiting all combat ships above minor "mosquito craft." For the first time in history all important naval arms have been limited by mutual agreement between great naval Powers, limited not only as regards maximum tonnage of various classes, but as regards replacement as well. The disaster of Geneva in 1927 has now been retrieved. While the Agreement lasts only until 1936, it is scarcely conceivable that the three Powers concerned will forego the security and confidence which the Agreement has brought about and revert to the uncertainty, distrust and competition to which they have been accustomed in pre-Agreement days.

As between the United States and the British Empire the agreement was consummated on the basis of substantial, not mathematical, "parity" between the two fleets. This conception of parity, unpopular with certain naval authorities on both sides of the Atlantic, is a political, not a technical definition. It was achieved only because both Governments receded from impossible positions adopted at Geneva in 1927 when each was thinking in terms of possible war with the other. But the present agreement represents more than a diplomatic solution of technical difficulties; nor is it a mere compromise. It is based essentially on the assumption that war between the two Powers is no longer possible. Although privately asserted by both British and Americans that war between the two Powers was "unthinkable" and "impossible", it was never officially banned until the Kellogg Pact. The joint note issued by President Hoover and Mr. MacDonald after the Rapidan conversations last October significantly declared:

"Both our Governments resolve to accept the Peace Pact not only as a declaration of good intentions, but as a positive obligation to direct national policy in accordance with its pledge.

Therefore, in a new and reinforced sense, the two Governments not only declare that war between them is unthinkable, but that distrusts and suspicions arising from doubts and fears which may have been justified before the Peace Pact must now cease to influence national policy. We approach old historical problems from a new angle and in a new atmosphere. On the assumption that war between us is banished, and that conflicts between our military and naval forces cannot take place, those problems have changed their meaning and character, and their solution, in ways satisfactory to both countries, has become possible."

The spirit of the Peace Pact is thus the moral foundation of the agreement on parity. The naval agreement is, therefore, a clear indication to the world that the United States and Great

Britain, in the words of Mr. MacDonald, having put their names to the Pact, mean to abide by their signatures.

As respects Japan, war with the United States or Great Britain had already been made virtually impossible by the Four Power Pact of Washington, 1922, which limited fortifications in the north-eastern Pacific, a measure which removed the fleets of the respective Powers from effective striking distance of one another. There remained, however, the troublesome question of ratios, a question solved amicably by compromises permitting Japan approximately two-thirds the cruiser tonnage of the United States and Great Britain and equality in submarines and destroyers. This solution was possible simply because it did not seriously alter the strategical situation set up at Washington.

Two other advances may be noted, though these are of more interest to students of naval history than to students of international politics. The battleship holiday begun at Washington in 1922 has been extended and enlarged. No replacements are to be made prior to 1936, except in the case of France and Italy who are permitted to carry out their 1927 and 1929 programmes as provided for at Washington, but which they have not yet fulfilled. Further, nine battleships in all are to be scrapped within thirty months by the British Empire, the United States and Japan combined. These two items, it is estimated, will relieve the overburdened taxpayer of some billion dollars, no mean sum in these days of heavy taxes.

A further advance of interest occurred in the Five Power Agreement limiting the size, though not the total tonnage, of submarines. In addition, the submarine is declared to be subject to virtually the same rules of international law as surface craft when operating against merchant shipping. It is worth noting that this clause is of indefinite duration, unlike the rest of the treaty, which is limited to six years. This attempt to

“humanize” the submarine by fiat has amused the cynic who sees in it either a subterfuge to cover the fact of real disagreement at London, or at best naïf belief in the regeneration of man as a fighting animal. “How,” he asks, “can any nation be expected to abide by such a declaration in war time?” The cynic, however, overlooks important facts. France, in proposing the article, like the other states who accepted it, is fully aware that the German submarine methods in the last war were a boomerang which united against her nations otherwise neutral. The world has moved forward since 1915; the web of international life has been woven closer and international opinion is better organized. Unrestricted submarine warfare to-day, though it might, perhaps, be less of a shock to world opinion than in 1915, would almost certainly produce a quicker and more effective reaction in view of the development of the League and other agencies of international opinion and co-operation. Perhaps more important is the fact that the submarine is losing its strategical value as a destroyer of commerce. The development of defence mechanism for detecting under-water craft and the success during the closing months of the Great War of the convoy system have relieved even Great Britain of much of its fear of the submarine while the cost of construction and operation of the submarine, combined with its delicate and complex machinery so easily put out of commission, is weighing heavily with naval experts who hitherto regarded it as a revolutionary offensive arm.

Whatever the outcome of the efforts towards general disarmament, the days of the submarine and the super-dreadnaught seem to be numbered. Some hopes were expressed prior to the London Conference that they might be eliminated there, but these hopes were doomed to disappointment. As for the battleship, American naval opinion at least still considers it an essential unit of the battle fleet and is not prepared for a move so drastic, while the submarine is still a popular

weapon in France and Japan, though the United States and Great Britain would gladly abolish it. It is declared, however, on good authority that French naval experts admitted privately at London a loss of faith in the submarine, but having induced Jacques Bonhomme to spend his treasures on it, the admirals dare not destroy overnight his faith in its effectiveness. There is thus reason to hope that the next Naval Conference scheduled for 1935 may find opinion prepared for drastic reductions, if not for the complete abolition of both arms.

So much for advances at London. On the other side we must mark up a stark failure. The Conference fell short of its main objective which was to bring France and Italy into a comprehensive limitation agreement. The demand of Italy for parity with France, and the French demand for guarantees of security prior to reducing or limiting arms proved insurmountable obstacles.

This failure, indeed, injects an element of uncertainty into the Three Power Agreement. Although the Agreement closed the door to competition between the three Powers, Article 21, the so-called "escalator" clause inserted to protect the British "two-power" standard in the Mediterranean, gave to any of the three—Great Britain, France, and Italy—should it feel menaced by the naval construction of any state outside the agreement, the right to increase its arms in any category after notice to the other two. The other two in turn are then entitled to increase their respective fleets in proportion. Were Great Britain to exercise her rights under this article by increasing her cruiser tonnage to meet Italian and French competition, American suspicion of British good faith might easily be aroused. Were the United States to follow the British lead she might, in turn, arouse Japanese suspicions. Disarmament might thus be imperilled, and the work of London might even be undone. This danger, however, is rather remote.

Whatever their grudges against each other, neither France nor Italy is anxious to see an increase in the British fleet. Further, an orgy of naval building sufficient to upset present British supremacy in the Mediterranean is very probably beyond the reach of both French and Italian exchequers within the next five years. Fleets are not built on faith nor over night.

The Franco-Italian situation cannot, however, be dismissed as of only transient importance. Since Locarno Italy has been supplanting Germany as the *bête-noir* in French foreign policy. This has been brought about not only by the bellicose thunderings of Mussolini, staged, one suspects, for the entertainment of a domestic audience rather than as a prelude to action, but likewise by the fact that French and Italian interests clash at many points. The growing demand in Italy for colonies to relieve the pressure of population can be most easily satisfied at the expense of France. Boundary disputes involving Italian territorial claims arising from the Peace Conference are still outstanding along the borders of Libya and Somaliland. In addition, there is Tunis. Italy has never forgiven France for the seizure of Tunis a half century ago. Then and now Italian colonists have outnumbered French and for the most part they refuse to become naturalized French citizens. Italian chauvinists, moreover, freely point to Tunis as a "natural" Italian colony on the basis of proximity, history, and population.

Fascism and democracy, further, are unalterably opposed in principle. To the French republican, Fascism appears as dangerous a phenomenon as Bolshevism to an American capitalist. In Mussolini they see not only an incipient Napoleon, anxious for territorial expansion, but also the personification of the reactionary doctrines of Fascism. Fascists, on their side, repudiate democracy with all the fervour of new converts, and regard democratic France as the benighted exponent of

an outworn and hostile creed. This antithesis between political ideals has become of practical importance through the refuge afforded in France and French colonies to anti-Fascists who, it is alleged, abuse the hospitality of French soil by plotting against the present Italian regime.

These are, however, mere irritants to the real trouble, which is the evident distrust by Italy of the French military hegemony of Europe. Since Europe broke up into independent states, the fear of dominance by a single Power or group of Powers has been an ever-present force in diplomacy. It was this which united other states against Charles V and Philip II of Spain in the sixteenth century, against Louis XIV in the seventeenth, against Napoleon in the nineteenth, and against the German War Lords in our own day. From this fear sprang the principle of the balance of power, a principle as natural to European diplomacy as the Monroe Doctrine is to the United States. Since the war there has been no balance of power in Europe; France and her allies have been in the saddle. Nor has the League of Nations so far offered a sufficient *quid pro quo* to induce them to dismount.

Italy has been chafing under these conditions. The extravagant national pride of Italy has suffered with the rise of France, but it is more than a question of self-esteem. There is the obvious fact that in the event of war Italy would be at the mercy of a superior fleet in the Mediterranean. Without iron, coal, oil, copper; without adequate food supplies, Italy is in no position, whatever the size of her army, to fight a first class war unless the sea remains open. The prospect of a superior French army and navy and of a network of alliances might equally concern a Socialist as a Fascist Government. The demand for parity with France is, however, more than a mere matter of national pride and of naval strategy. It is a matter essentially of political prestige. In diplomacy, arms, whether military or naval, are often useful, not alone for pur-

poses of defence against potential enemies, but for making friends as well, and there are many signs that Mussolini is endeavouring to build up a system of alliances counter to the French. He has already cemented Hungarian sentiment by treaty and has been coquetting with Bulgaria and Spain. The Lateran Accord was obviously intended to secure support abroad even to a greater extent than at home.

The European situation, moreover, is ripening for an Italian bid for power. The defeated Powers, Germany, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Austria, find the disarmament clause of the peace treaties irksome. From time to time warnings have been uttered at Geneva, particularly by the German and Hungarian governments, that unless the members of the League disarm in accordance with their undertakings under Article VIII of the Covenant, it may be impossible to prevent popular demand in the various defeated countries from compelling their governments to increase armaments beyond the treaty limits. The defeated Powers thus are almost ready to be swept into the Italian camp in common cause against French supremacy. Europe, indeed, is tottering near the brink of a renewal of the vicious system of balance of power with its inevitable competition in armaments and alliances. It is this danger which makes the Italian-French situation of such paramount international importance.

From the outset there was little prospect that the Franco-Italian situation could be solved at the Conference with complete satisfaction to all concerned. To France arms and allies are recommended alike by history and the contemporary state of Europe. The Italian demand for parity is a clear challenge to France's present position as the arbiter of Western and Central Europe. This position has been attained, however, less by a direct bid for power, than indirectly through the search for national security. France suffers from an inferiority complex due primarily to two invasions from the north-east

within living memory, and to a low birth rate. In her view, security consists in the preservation of the *status quo* in Europe, a condition which finds Germany disarmed and central Europe a patchwork of small competing states. Logic indicates two ways, and two ways only, in which the *status quo* may be preserved—either by French arms and allies, or by a League of Nations which is itself a sort of Holy Alliance against those who might seek to disturb the Versailles settlement. The League has never become a real alliance against aggressors, hence France has fallen back on arms and allies as her means of security. Nor has the Kellogg Pact altered this attitude. The complete absence in the Pact of machinery for settling disputes, of definition of aggression, and of provisions for co-operative action against aggressors seems to Frenchmen to render it valueless as a means of promoting French security.

France is not, however, wedded indefinitely to her present policies. She has repeatedly offered to barter for a tightening up of League sanctions. The Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance of 1923, and the Geneva Protocol of 1924 were attempts toward this end. Locarno was a real advance but on one flank only since it offers security against Germany alone, and French logic demands a more comprehensive and systematic system of guarantees. Even before the Conference met, France made it clear that the limitation of naval arms was interdependent on further guarantees of security. During the first few weeks the issue was shelved by the discussion on method of procedure, but it was raised again by a definite bid for some form of security agreement, or of a "Mediterranean Locarno" on the return of the French delegation in March after M. Tardieu had formed his second Ministry. The request received its quietus publicly in a radio address by Mr. MacDonald in which he declared:

“We shall not agree to base any treaty which may result from the Naval Conference in entangling alliances. The bonds of war are not, and cannot be, the security of peace. That would undo in spirit and in policy the work of the Conference.”

A second attempt to satisfy French demands was made in discussions on a “consultative” Pact similar to the Four-Power Treaty of Washington, 1922, by which the Powers agreed to meet to discuss the situation should any of the four be menaced by new naval developments on the part of other Powers in the Pacific. The attempt failed, however, in part at least because of American fears that reduction of the French navy secured at the price of a consultative pact might entail a moral obligation on the part of the United States, or at least the expectation on the part of France that in the event of danger the United States would go to the aid of France. A third attempt occurred in an effort on the part of the British and French delegations to clarify Article XVI of the Covenant of the League so as to make more certain the application of sanctions in the event of war; but this too failed. Failing alike to effect an agreement with Italy or gain additional guarantees of security, France declined to enter an agreement to limit naval arms.

The London Conference has made abundantly clear that disarmament is, after all, a political and not a technical problem. Signor Grandi put this with commendable frankness to the Conference:

“The limitation of armaments means the acceptance by Governments of restrictions to a fundamental right inherent in national sovereignty. The voluntary renunciation of freedom of action in the matter of armaments is essentially a political act. We should not fear to state that we are here not so much to solve a technical, but first and foremost a political question.”

In so far as political issues were solved or were non-existent, the Conference succeeded in limiting armaments; in so far as they were left outstanding, it failed. The two fundamental issues—the Franco-Italian tension, and the problem of French security—still remain.

“This is but another stage,” said Mr. MacDonald in his closing address, “and the work will have to be continued. We must go on attacking the problems that have baffled us. . . . True the work has been but partially done, but all great advances of this kind must be by stages and we have gone much farther than has as yet been possible. . . . We must go on strengthening the new mentality of peace and applying it, step by step, in further reductions.”

The experience of London raises, however, the grave question whether any other advances are possible by direct frontal attack on armaments as has been the method in the Naval Conferences at Washington, Geneva, and London. The experience of the various League commissions on the problem has been similar; no real progress has been made precisely because political issues remained unsettled. May not the next step, a step which must be taken before the next Naval Conference in 1935, be to explore the possibilities of settling the political problems which have prevented alike action by the League and further successes at London? On their solution depends not alone the future of armaments, but hope of securing peace by organization rather than by arms and alliances.

THE PROVINCES AND THE SUPREMACY OF THE TREATY POWER

BY B. K. SANDWELL

A RESPECT for the federal principle in the constitution is very profound among Canadians, and not without reason. They are faced with the task of preserving and increasing the sense of national unity among a people scattered over a vast area and exhibiting a wide diversity of racial characteristics. Among such a people the price of maintaining a central authority which shall be strong where it needs to be strong is to maintain also a set of local authorities which shall be equally strong and entirely independent of the central authority in all matters for which unity is not indispensable. The pattern was set for us by the thirteen revolted colonies to the south, who found that to build up an absolutely new nation, without the aid of past unitary tradition or of present military peril, was impossible without the use of the federal principle. Nearly a hundred years later we undertook the same task and came to the same conclusion. None of the disadvantages of divided sovereignty which have since made themselves apparent—and they are not few—have sufficed to change our opinion. We still look upon the preservation of the utmost possible freedom for the Canadian Provinces as the *sine qua non* of the preservation of the strength and unity of the Canadian Dominion.

There is one domain in which we are in considerable danger of pushing this regard for the federal principle too far; one sphere of governmental activity in which the jealous reservation of rights to the Provinces can result only in destroying an indispensable right of the Dominion. This is the sphere of international relations, of treaty making and treaty

executing. The division of sovereignty into two fields, the local and the national, with an impartial judicial authority to determine the limits of each, is an excellent thing in all matters of purely internal interest. In external matters, in those matters in which other nations have a right to take an interest, it becomes unworkable. For all dealings with a foreign power, sovereignty should be vested in one authority, and should be complete and absolute. Foreign nations cannot be expected to deal with two governments in the same territory, nor to submit to the decisions of a domestic court within that territory on the question of the rights of these governments to perform what they have undertaken to perform. Plenipotentiaries must be plenipotentiaries; they must have full powers to deal with the subject with which they are appointed to deal. A government which has the right to make war should have the right to take any action which may be necessary for the avoidance of war. For such a government to have to plead that certain of such acts, though legitimate and proper in themselves, are not within the scope of its sovereignty is simply to invite trouble.

During the recent Dominion elections a considerable part of the contention between the two parties turned, in the Province of Ontario, upon the question of the seat of authority for dealing with the development of waterpower in boundary waters. In the course of the controversy Premier Ferguson took the ground that the Province of Ontario, of whose Government he was the head, could not admit the right of the Dominion "to deal with the property of the Province" in any international negotiations. Leaving aside Mr. Ferguson's platform utterances, which might in the ardour of a lively campaign have gone slightly beyond his actual constitutional attitude, and confining ourselves to the carefully prepared text of his communication to the press as printed on June 30, we find him explicitly demanding for the Province the right to

“sit in” at any international conference and “expedite the negotiations” when waterpowers in the Province’s territory are concerned. The passages in which this claim is made are part of a reasoned objection to the form of words proposed by the Dominion Government to represent the terms on which waterpowers in navigable (including boundary) waters should be dealt with. The Dominion proposed that this formula for expressing the relations between itself and the Provinces should open with a preamble reading as follows:

“With due recognition of the paramount rights of navigation and subject to the observance of any necessary international requirements, the Dominion Government is prepared,” etc.

To this reservation Mr. Ferguson took exception in the following words:

“Ontario can never agree to hand over to the Federal authority, or anyone else, the right to deal with its waterpowers as they may see fit in any international negotiations. We are quite prepared to sit in at any conference and expedite the negotiations, but we will not transfer the control of provincial property to any other authority.”

At another point in his communication to the press, Mr. Ferguson says of the phrase about “international requirements”:

“This clearly means that the Federal Government in its international negotiations wants to deal with the property of the Province in any way it sees fit without reference to the Province. For example, the actual power development could be placed anywhere in any section of the river either on the American or Canadian side, and the Province, which owns the power, would be precluded from being consulted or having any voice in the matter. I am sure that the people of Ontario are not prepared to surrender their property in such a manner.”

This language can have only one meaning. That meaning is that Mr. Ferguson holds, and believes that the people of Ontario hold, that the Dominion Government must not be permitted to possess an absolute and unqualified power for the making of treaties; that its power must be limited to dealing with those subjects which are assigned to it by the British North America Act and to the neutral subjects about which no specific power is conferred upon the Provinces; that if the Dominion Government should make a treaty affecting the proprietary rights of the Province of Ontario, that treaty, so far as it affected those rights and so far as it was not participated in or consented to by the Province, must be held null and void.

Now this is a tenable theory of the proper relations between the central and local sovereignties in a federal constitution. It must be tenable, for it is actually practised by the United States. It is not uncommon in that country for the validity of a treaty, or of a part thereof, to be contested in the United States courts by an individual State, upon the ground that the Federal Government did not under the constitution possess the power to make a treaty upon the particular subject-matter in question. In other words, the constitution of the United States is interpreted as not conferring upon the Federal Government at Washington the right to make a treaty invading the rights of the States, just as Mr. Ferguson desires that the constitution of Canada shall be interpreted as not conferring upon the Government at Ottawa the right to make a treaty invading the provincial control of waterpower.

But while Mr. Ferguson's theory of the proper relations between the two Governments is tenable, there are two very strong reasons why it should not be entertained. The first is that the opposite theory has already been embodied in our constitution by the Fathers of Confederation, and would have to be eliminated from it before Mr. Ferguson's theory could

be put into effect. The second is that when put into effect the theory has extremely bad results upon the international relations, and possibly also upon the internal unity, of the federal nation itself.

The British North America Act does not contemplate the actual making of treaties by the Dominion of Canada. But it does very fully contemplate the execution of them, when the Imperial authorities have made them, by the Dominion of Canada, if they are to have any effect in the Dominion; and it confers upon the Federal Government a full and complete power to do anything which may be necessary for such execution. The clause says:

“The Parliament and Government of Canada shall have all powers necessary or proper for performing the obligations of Canada or of any Province thereof, as part of the British Empire, towards foreign countries arising under treaties between the Empire and such foreign countries.”

For a long time after the passing of that Act, treaties continued to be made, not by Canada but by the Imperial authorities on behalf of Canada; but the execution of them, so far as it fell to Canada, was always performed by the Parliament and Government of the Dominion; and since that Parliament and Government had presumably the right to refuse to execute a treaty if they so desired, it is evident that the Imperial authorities in their treaty-making operations were little more than agents of the Canadian Government. The making itself has now been taken over by the Dominion, with Imperial consent. It is possible that Mr. Ferguson, or the people of Ontario, may argue that while the Province was willing to tolerate the possession by the Dominion of power to execute treaties made by the Empire, it is not willing to tolerate an unlimited power in the Dominion to make and execute its own treaties. It is possible that the Privy Council might be induced to hold that the overriding power granted in this

clause applies to treaties "made" by the Empire alone, and not to treaties "made" by the Dominion as the legatee or grantee of the Imperial power. In that case an amendment to the British North America Act may be necessary before the Dominion can enjoy the same plenary powers for executing its own treaties as it already enjoys for executing those made by the Empire. Ontario would, if Mr. Ferguson's estimate of its opinion is correct, oppose such an amendment, and ask that the Dominion Government be prevented from "dealing with the property of the Province" in international negotiations, and presumably also that the Province be given the power (which it does not now possess) of itself engaging in international negotiations when its property is to be dealt with. As a matter of fact it is unlikely that the Privy Council would come to any such conclusion; it is far more likely to rule that treaties made by the Dominion are made by it as an agent, inheritor or devisee of the Empire, and are covered by the treaty clause of the British North America Act just as much as if they had been made at Westminster. In that event Mr. Ferguson would be obliged either himself to seek an amendment to the Act, or to accept the situation and recognize that the Dominion has a right to "deal with the property of the Province" in international negotiations.

But even if the Fathers of Confederation had not definitely pronounced on the question, and granted to the Dominion Government a plenary power for the execution of treaties, there would still be a very strong case, purely on grounds of public interest, for granting such a power to the central government and withholding from the local governments any power either to make treaties for themselves or to block in any way the making of treaties by the central government. It is true that in the United States, from which country we take a good deal of our conception of the federal principle, the division of sovereignty between the central and local govern-

ments is held to extend even to matters of international negotiation, so that the sovereignty of the State debars the sovereignty of the United States from performing any acts, even in pursuance of a treaty, which are not within the limits assigned to the national authority. (Since by a curious accident the States themselves are expressly prohibited from entering into international negotiations, it has resulted that there is a large group of subjects about which foreign nations can find no authority in the United States with which they can deal; this has been held to be the case, for example, with the Chicago water diversion, which the United States Government declined to mention in the 1909 Treaty because it did not believe that it had the power to enforce any obligations which it might undertake; subsequent decisions of the Supreme Court have somewhat improved the position of the federal authority on this matter, but there are still plenty of other matters about which Washington cannot obligate itself, and about which the individual States cannot negotiate with foreign powers.) But nobody can say that the results of this limitation of the national sovereignty in the United States have been beneficial, even to the individual States which it is supposed to protect; and the history of the American Constitution makes it perfectly clear that no such limitation was intended by the authors of the great document of 1787.

The interpretation of the meaning and effect of that document, as entertained at the time by three of the ablest minds among its authors and supporters, is to be found in the famous collection of essays, entitled *The Federalist*. In Essay No. 64, by John Jay, first Chief Justice of the United States, is to be found a defence of the Constitution's provisions concerning the treaty-making power—a defence which is chiefly concerned with repelling exactly the same attack as is now being made by Mr. Ferguson. For there were apprehensions, Jay tells us, “that the President and Senate may make treaties

without an equal eye to the interests of all the States," and that "two-thirds will oppress the remaining third"—that is, that two-thirds of the States, which are equally represented in the Senate, would by their power to approve treaties cause injustice to the remaining States.

If Jay had believed what is now (but largely in virtue of a subsequent amendment) believed of the American Constitution, namely, that it gives the central authority no greater powers in respect of treaties than in respect of any other kind of action, it would not have been necessary for him to enter into this defence of the treaty-making provisions; the interests of the individual States would have been protected in international negotiations by exactly the same safeguards as protect them in all other respects. But in Jay's time there was no suggestion that the treaty power of the central government was not just as full and complete as that of the most absolute monarchy. The Constitution declared that treaties were to be the supreme law of the land. There was then no other clause in the Constitution to suggest that parts of this "supreme law" were invalidated and were not law because of conflict with certain rights reserved to the individual States.

Jay defends the doctrine of unlimited treaty-making power in the central government, in language which possibly went as far as it could in a country where national feeling was yet in its infancy, but which might be carried a great deal further to-day.

"In proportion as the United States assume a national form and a national character, so will the good of the whole be more and more an object of attention, and the government must be a weak one indeed if it should forget that the good of the whole can only be promoted by advancing the good of each of the parts or members which compose the whole."

That was written in an age of intense mutual suspicion and local selfishness between the lately revolted colonies which

were reluctantly taking upon themselves the bonds of unity for the purpose of organizing into a new nation. Had the United States by that time assumed somewhat more of "a national form and a national character," it might have been possible to argue that the good of the whole is so supreme an object that it may at times be right and proper to pursue it even at the expense of some detriment to a part; that for the sake of presenting a front of unity before the world, the separate interests of individual States or Provinces ought no longer to be a matter of exclusive concern when it comes to governmental dealings with other nations; that a nation which cannot speak with one voice in international negotiations is only half a nation; that a State or Province which claims the right to "sit in" at diplomatic conferences is claiming one of the most essential rights of separate nationhood, and is therefore in effect breaking up the confederation to which it purports to belong.

The present American system of a limited treaty-making power in the central government was not, therefore, contemplated by the authors of the Constitution. It was never deliberately adopted by anybody. It crept into the Constitution by way of a general interpretative amendment, which was passed in the period of extreme States-rights opinion which preceded and culminated in the Civil War. The purposes which were held in view when that amendment was passed were purely domestic, being chiefly concerned with the slavery question, and it is highly improbable that the authors of the amendment paused to think about the effect that it might have on the treaty-making power. It is therefore more or less of an accident that the United States to-day finds itself in the position of not being able to make a treaty which can be accepted by either its own people or other nations as valid and binding, until it has been passed upon by the Supreme Court and declared to be not in conflict with the Constitution. This

is surely not a pleasant position for the United States or for the nations which have to do business with it. It would have been even more unpleasant than it has been were it not for the fact that a large class of the subjects of diplomatic negotiation in which State rights are likely to interfere is the class which arises along inland boundary lines, between the nation and its immediate neighbours; and the United States has been singularly fortunate in its two immediate neighbours, one of which is weak in military power and resources, while the other has for a century or more been animated by the desire to avoid a serious dispute with the United States at almost any cost. It is interesting to conjecture what, for instance, would have been the attitude of the northern neighbour of the United States towards the contention of the Washington Government that the Chicago diversion was a purely local matter and was beyond its power to remedy, if that northern neighbour had been a part of the German Empire rather than of the British.

There will be trouble enough in the negotiations about the international section of the St. Lawrence, arising out of the inability of the United States Government to guarantee that it can prevent the State of New York from doing something, in the exercise of its sovereign powers, which will defeat the arrangements made by treaty for the division of waterpower between the two countries. It would be deplorable if Canada were to find herself in an equally undignified position owing to a similar inability to "deal with the waterpowers" of Ontario "in international negotiations."

It seems strange that this revival of states-rights doctrine, in this period of advanced national consciousness, should proceed from Ontario, the wealthiest and most populous of the Provinces, and the one which we should have supposed most capable of protecting itself against "oppression" from the federal authority by the exercise of its own immense electoral

and economic power. Prince Edward Island might reasonably feel a certain diffidence about its ability to secure fair treatment from a Dominion Government by the force of its voting power or its economic strength; but scarcely Ontario. It is equally strange that this states-rights doctrine should proceed from the Province which during the war was most insistent upon the exercise by the federal authority of the fullest measure of power over the lives and persons of its subjects, alike in Provinces which favoured conscription and in that which did not.

The states-rights doctrine, or its counterpart in Sections 92 and 93 and other parts of the British North America Act, is entitled to all respect insofar as it has actually been embodied in the Canadian constitution or may be read into it by impartial courts. But a states-rights doctrine which runs counter to the conception of Canadian nationhood entertained by the Fathers, which involves a radical change in the constitution, which requires the Dominion to go into diplomatic conference with other nations with its hands tied as regards half the possible subjects of discussion, which requires foreign nations to await the decision of a Canadian or British court before they can tell whether they should negotiate with the Dominion or with a Province, or to accept the decision of such a court as regards the validity of a bargain which they have already made—such a states-rights doctrine needs to be scrutinized very carefully by the people of Canada, and of every division of Canada, before it is adopted as an essential part of Canadian federalism.

The paralysis of national action, and the loss of national dignity, which can result from a limitation of the treaty power such as Mr. Ferguson proposes are not so fully exhibited in the particular case with which he deals as they might be in various other cases. One or two examples may be instructive. The regulation of conditions of employment is a provincial

subject in Canada, and the Dominion cannot normally legislate upon it; similarly it is a State subject in the United States, and legislation passed at Washington concerning it has been declared null by the Supreme Court. There is a growing and inevitable tendency towards international agreement about such things as the employment of women and children and the conditions under which they may work. The United States is completely debarred from entering into any such agreements, for the Federal Government cannot touch the subject and the States, which could touch it, cannot enter into agreements with foreign powers. Canada, on the other hand, can make such agreements, and if they are embodied in treaties any legislation which she may adopt at Ottawa and which is "necessary or proper for performing the obligations of Canada" under such treaties will be *ipso facto* valid. The states-rights contention would make it impossible for Canada to join in any such agreements, for it is obvious that she would not be conforming to their terms so long as a single Province failed to pass the requisite legislation, and unanimity among the Provinces is almost inconceivable. Again, the Province of British Columbia is at the present moment proceeding towards the exclusion of Japanese from the licensed fishing industry, an effort which would be beyond the constitutional powers of the Province if pursued directly but which can apparently be lawfully pursued by the device of exercising "discretion" in the granting of the licenses. (The device is not original to British Columbia, being an imitation of the methods employed by the Southern States to nullify the post-Civil War amendments to the American Constitution.) It is easily conceivable that if the Dominion of Canada had no power, even under a treaty, to put a stop to this discrimination, Canada might at some future date lose important potential benefits, and even incur appreciable losses or dangers, from the resentment of the Japanese nation. But under the extreme states-rights

contention Canada would be compelled to say to Japan, in effect: "We do not, as a whole, altogether sympathize with the actions of the Province of British Columbia, and we should like to come to some agreement with you on the subject, but unfortunately we cannot do anything about it. In this matter we are neither daughter in our mother's house nor mistress in our own. Possibly if you were to send an Envoy Plenipotentiary to Victoria, B.C., you might get results."

It is obvious that this conception of the treaty power as supreme involves the occasional overriding of the ordinary constitutional rights of the Provinces by the Dominion. To the type of mind to which Provincial rights seem to be the sole safeguard of liberty and economic progress for the people of a given Province, and any invasion of those rights by the people of the whole Dominion appears as a threat to that same liberty and progress—to the type of mind which predominated in the United States about the middle of the nineteenth century—this conception will appear wrong. To such a mind it will seem that not even the necessities of responsible intercourse between nations can justify any invasion of the ordinary rights of the lesser governmental unit. But that was not the type of mind of the Fathers of Confederation. They had sufficient faith in the fairness and goodwill of the whole people of the new nation which they were creating, to enable them to decree, and to induce the legislators of Great Britain to decree, that in that limited class of subjects which can become essential to the making of a treaty with a foreign power, the Federal Government should have the right to do or enact whatever the treaty required it to do or enact. In the ordinary course of events it is important that Ontario should have the full control of its own waterpowers, that Prince Edward Island should (if it so desired, which it would not) be able to allow the employment of six-year-old children sixty hours a week, that British Columbia should have the right to deny fishing licenses to

everybody except the Native Sons of Canada. But when such matters become of sufficient international import to call for the making of treaties concerning them between Canada and other nations, then it becomes equally if not more important that Canada, as a nation, should have the right to overrule these various Provinces, if necessary, in order to be able to speak with a single and effective voice in the councils of the world. It is as desirable to-day as it was in 1867 that the Parliament and Government of Canada should have "all powers necessary or proper for performing the obligations . . . arising under treaties."

THE CASE AGAINST IMMIGRATION

BY R. M. LOWER

THE question of immigration has been discussed in Canada too little from the standpoint of the large general problem of which it forms a part, that of the peopling of the North American continent as a whole. It is therefore proposed to present a brief resumé of the history of population in Canada in the hope that certain principles will emerge which can be applied to our present problem.

In that it has been their lot to play a significant part in the greatest occurrence in history, the creation of a new world, Canadians are a privileged people. The surge and roll of the flood of humanity as it has burst over this continent has not only constituted a drama of heroic proportions but has also provided unparalleled opportunities for observing how man as an animal disperses himself about the world and how as a human being he creates societies. When Englishmen first came to America, they had a continent before them. They proceeded to occupy it, and by the time of the Revolution, the original settlers had increased to some three million persons. With almost mathematical regularity they had doubled their numbers each twenty-five years. In this striking performance, immigration had played a very small part. Massachusetts, for example, which was the most populous province in 1760, received all told, during the 130 years from its founding, probably not more than 50,000 immigrants, or considerably less than an average of 500 per year. The reasons for the increase in numbers of the colonists are obvious. They were a healthy stock and there was land enough and to spare. It was very easy for a young man just starting life to obtain

enough land to live on. If he were to use it, it was essential for him to marry and surround himself with a family. The story of the growth of population in that oft-misunderstood province, New France, is similar. Except in the period before 1715, one of almost constant warfare, during the eighteenth century the population doubled regularly in slightly less than 26 years. There was virtually no immigration. Under British rule the experience was similar, and the population of the province of Lower Canada continued until 1851 to double in between 25 and 26 years. In this period also there was little immigration, for newcomers were, as a rule, deterred from settlement in a French province and proceeded farther west. In English America and in French America, the population doubled about every 25 years. It would seem, therefore, that this rate of increase was normal for a healthy young community having plenty of room for expansion.

From 1851 onward the rate of increase of the population of Lower Canada, or the province of Quebec, declined rapidly. At any time in the fifty years from 1851 to 1901 the rate was such as to double the population not in twenty-five years but in ninety years. There was no abrupt decrease in the birth rate or increase in the death rate. There was, however, a fairly considerable increase in immigration over the earlier period. Why then was the old rate not maintained?

In Upper Canada, during the thirty-seven years, 1814 to 1851, the population increased at such a rate as to double itself every twelve years. This was an experience which was quite comparable with that of the new states then being settled and which has not been equalled in Canada since, even in our western provinces. During this period there was extensive immigration. It is difficult to determine the exact amount because many of those recorded as immigrants passed on to the Western States, but a rough estimate of the annual arrivals who remained in the country would be from fifteen to twenty

thousand. There is no doubt that these numbers affected the rate at which the population of Upper Canada grew though they did not by any means account for the entire growth. After 1851, or more markedly after 1861, Ontario shared the experience of Quebec, and a population which in the nineteen years prior to 1861 had tripled, after that date actually required fifty years to double itself.

It was about the middle of the century that people began to leave Canada and go to the United States. In 1850, there were in the United States 147,000 natives of British North America; in 1920, there were over one million Canadian born residents in that country. Save for the first two decades of the twentieth century, the increase has been continuous and regular. During those fifty years of something unpleasantly like stagnation approximately one out of every two children born in Canada sooner or later found his way to the United States. The surprising concomitant of this large emigration was a large immigration. During the decade of the 'eighties, for example, no less than 886,177 newcomers sought our shores. The same conditions which were drawing away our native-born were likewise drawing away the immigrant and it is therefore not surprising to find that in this decade the immigrant population increased by only some 40,000. It is obvious, therefore, that no amount of immigration could compensate for the forces which were keeping our population almost stationary. The sole bright spot on the horizon was in the west. With the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, a national achievement scarcely less significant than Confederation itself, population began to pour out upon the Western plains and Manitoba grew at a rate recalling that of Upper Canada before 1850.

The new century saw a third period open in the history of Canada's population. Here one is on familiar ground, for everyone remembers something of the spectacular growth

after 1900, especially in the three Western Prairie Provinces. From 1900 to 1914 conditions in the West were very similar to those in the East before 1850; in both cases there were large areas of vacant land suitable for agriculture. It required little persuasion to induce people to come and possess them. In 1914 we entered a fourth period of population growth. From 1914 to 1919 we received very few immigrants; from 1919 to the present we have been receiving 100,000 or more a year. Our population has been increasing at about the same rate as it did prior to the opening of the west, or perhaps a little faster.

A glance back over the last century and a quarter reveals three well-marked periods in the history of Canadian expansion and the beginning of a fourth, a half-century of rapid settlement and growth, a half-century—to give it the best name possible—of consolidation, and a quarter century of swift development. During the first of these periods, 1800-1850, all the provinces grew rapidly at approximately equal rates. Immigration, small in amount if judged by present standards, was important, though the provinces which did not receive many immigrants were not very much slower in their rates of growth than those which received the most. During the second period, 1850-1900, despite a considerably larger annual immigration than in the first, population increased very slowly and emigration went on continuously. During the third period, 1900-1921, the population of the majority of the provinces increased rapidly. Emigration fell off but did not cease and immigration became very large. But, as in the earlier period, most of the immigrants went away again.

Like all other things, the growth of human population is determined by natural law. Doubtless in a state of nature the numbers of the human species would tend over a long period to become stationary: they would respond to conditions in precisely the same ways as those of other species of animal. When food was abundant they would increase; when conditions were

hard they would decrease through starvation and disease. Though they are obscured by the complications of our civilization, these basic principles still operate. Even in the most sophisticated modern countries, population responds very directly to the means of subsistence. The England of the nineteenth century, for example, with the world's markets at her feet, and the ability to command wealth from every quarter of the globe, increased her population very rapidly. To-day in the face of a bitterly competitive world, English trade is fairly stationary and the population of England is increasing very slowly. Mankind responds to the means of subsistence as surely as the crops to the sunshine and the rain.

With the long experience to which we in Canada may refer—almost alone among nations we have records of our population from the beginnings of our history—we should be able to determine very accurately the laws of our growth. They must necessarily be only special applications of the general law just enunciated. As such they are not mysterious but are perfectly patent to those who take the trouble to inquire into them. In ordinary discussions of immigration, however, they are invariably almost completely disregarded.

In his report for 1856, the Commissioner of Crown Lands for the Province of Canada, in the course of a survey of the lands still remaining to the Crown, remarked that "Government has now no more lands to offer to settlers in that part of the province considered the most favourable for settlers and where by far the greater part of the sale and settlement of public lands has hitherto taken place." After giving a careful survey of the settled and unsettled regions of the province, he comes to the conclusion that the future progress of settlement must be slow and adds that "not only very many European emigrants but also a great and increasing number of the young men of the province and even the older settlers prefer (to the poor lands remaining in Canada) the easier livelihood that is

to be earned by cultivating the (American) prairies of the west." Here lies the explanation of the dramatic change in Canadian conditions which occurred about 1850. Once the good and available lands were taken up population had to stop growing. Our population was obeying the first law of growth and, not finding means of subsistence in Canada, was taking itself off to a region where it could find it.

From about 1860 to 1895, save for the infant west, comparatively few new sources of wealth were tapped in Canada. Agriculture, since there was no more good land, could not expand to any marked degree; that other Canadian staple, lumber, with the exhaustion of the white pine forests, could not increase very much in importance; mining was slight, and manufacturing was in its infancy. The perfectly natural result was a very slow increase in population, an increase which was not affected in the slightest, positively or negatively, by the efforts made to secure immigrants and by the large number of immigrants who actually did come. But when the West was opened the old story was repeated; large areas of fertile land were rendered available and population bounded forward.

It seems obvious then that one of the fundamental conditions of the growth of population in Canada has been the availability of large areas of good land, and, since we no longer have areas comparable with our original domain, we may rest assured that we shall never again have an expansion of settlement comparable with that of the periods before 1850 and after 1900. We may dismiss from our minds any notion that the spectacular days of twenty years ago will be repeated. For a good many years we probably will have expansion by settlement but we must be content to see settlement go forward modestly.

In the modern world the land does not constitute the sole means of subsistence and consequently we have many examples of countries in which population responds to industrial devel-

opment rather than to new areas of fertile soil. In this respect Germany has been conspicuous, and with the great growth in her industry which occurred from 1871 onward her population increased by leaps and bounds. In Canada we have also had our industrial development and it is therefore pertinent to inquire into its bearing on the growth of our population. For two generations or more all Canadians have been brought up in the faith that we have vast natural resources. This is doubtless true but we have seldom paused to ask ourselves why it is that these resources have been so slowly developed. The reason is not far to seek. We have scarcely a natural resource which has not been extremely hard to utilize. A century ago there was no more fertile land on the continent than in western Ontario, but how difficult it was in the days before railways, before even the St. Lawrence Canals were cut, for the farmer of Upper Canada to take full advantage of the good crops he could grow. It is at present only by reason of a most highly developed and delicately organized system of transportation that the crops of western Canada can be marketed. The old Red River Colony, for example, lay stagnant for half a century, unable, until it found an outlet, to utilize the "vast natural resources" which lay about it. After many years of effort and large expenditures of capital, the mineral wealth of our north country is now becoming available, but to win it has involved hard fighting, fighting against the woods and rocks of the pre-Cambrian wilderness, fighting against the rigours of a northern climate. How easy of access and development compared with these northern minerals of ours are the coal and iron deposits of the United States! Difficult development means slow development, and slow development of natural wealth means slow growth of population.

Apart from the presence or absence of internal difficulties, the growth of every new country depends upon the outlets it can find for its products. "The most important feature of

economic life in a newly settled community is its commercial connection with the rest of the world. On this more than upon any other circumstance depends its prosperity. The history of modern colonization does not show a single case where a newly-settled country has enjoyed any considerable economic prosperity or made notable social progress without a flourishing commerce with other communities. This dominance of foreign commerce in economic affairs may be considered the most characteristic feature of colonial economy."

If this dictum be applied to Canada it will be apparent at once that with respect to our economic organization we are still pretty much in the colonial stage. This is the explanation of that phenomenon with which our politicians like to flatter their audiences, namely, the high rank which Canada takes in the *per capita* amount of foreign trade. Older nations find in themselves a market which absorbs a large part of their total production but with us the home market can absorb only a fraction of our production. We are raising on an average now some four hundred million bushels of wheat a year but we can manage to use only about one-fifth of this ourselves. The remainder must be sold abroad. It is similar with most of our primary products; the limits of the home market for manufactured goods, likewise, are soon reached. In the case of the United States a home market very quickly grew up but we, because of natural factors over which we have no control, cannot expand indefinitely within ourselves. We cannot look forward to the day when we shall consume all our own wheat, all our own paper, all our own nickel, and we therefore must depend for our growth upon the increase of the demand of other peoples for our products. This fact was intuitively grasped by the Canadian pioneer whose frequent prayer was said to be, "Give us a good harvest and a bloody war in Europe." We have always had hectic prosperity during periods of war, simply because war meant large, if temporary,

increase in consumption abroad. We have also, unfortunately, usually had to "sober up" from the orgy of production after peace has been made.

The relationship between our growth and foreign demand is nicely illustrated by conditions in Canada since 1914. We had our war period of feverish prosperity. On the conclusion of the war, after a brief boom, came the reaction; European markets disappeared and our own productive machine slowed down. The effect on population was evident at once. The index number of employment fell rapidly. American immigration figures indicated that large numbers of people were leaving this country. These figures are confirmed by the 1926 census of our three prairie provinces. For a few years after the war European conditions were most uncertain and the prices of agricultural products were distinctly below the level of those goods the farmer was obliged to buy. The situation reacted definitely and inevitably on the growth of the three provinces. For the five years, 1916-1921, years of little or no immigration, their population increased by 15.19 per cent, a rapid rate. In the five years, 1921-1926, when immigration was considerable, they increased by 5.46 per cent, a rate poorer than that of the Dominion in the period of stagnation prior to 1896. Since 1926, now that conditions abroad are better, growth has begun again. But in the future as in the past the growth in population of the western provinces will depend upon the success they have in marketing their products and no amount of immigration will affect that growth in the slightest degree.

Two deductions regarding the growth of population in Canada may therefore be set forth.

1. Our population grows rapidly when there are large areas of fertile land available for settlement.
2. Otherwise, it will grow in proportion to the demand of the rest of the world for our products.

These are the laws of Canadian growth.

It is now desirable, as an aid in formulating a definite policy, to make some inquiry into the rate at which the country is likely to grow in the future. From 1861 to 1881 the annual growth was 1.7 per cent; from 1881 to 1901, it was 1.15 per cent; from 1901 to 1911 it was 3.7 per cent; from 1911 to 1921 it was 2.1 per cent; an average for the sixty years of 1.91 per cent, an average rendered unduly high by the great influx after 1900, and which cannot be repeated. We have no Dominion figures for the period since 1921 but our three western provinces during the first half of this period increased by about one per cent per annum, slightly less than the worst previous experience of the Dominion as a whole. We shall probably do a little better than that during the present five years, 1926 to 1931, but even providing we do very well we shall probably not grow at the rate of two per cent per annum for the ten years 1921 to 1931. The annual rate of increase in the United States at present is between one and one and a half per cent and I do not think we can hope to grow at a much faster rate than they are doing, more particularly as our chief market, Great Britain, is fast approaching a stationary population. It would, therefore, seem that if Canada continues to grow at the rate of one and a half per cent per annum, adding about 135,000 persons to its total every year, it will be doing very well.

Where are we to get the people who will provide an increase at this rate of growth. It happens that at present our natural increase, that is the surplus of births over deaths, is approximately 135,000, or one and a half per cent per annum. Obviously, then, we do not need to go outside our own borders for the population that we shall need for our future growth. The conclusion, therefore, is justified that we have no need of immigration to increase our population and if immigrants in large numbers continue to come to us there can be only one

result. Our own people, those who are born in the country, will have to go away. The presence or absence of immigration will not affect in the slightest degree the rate at which the country will grow, for this is dependent upon natural causes which we cannot influence much more than we can influence the weather.

It would appear to be very probable that we should be able to provide from our own population for a rate of growth much greater than that above named. During the nineteenth century, nearly every important nation in Europe except France increased its population at a rapid rate, much more rapid indeed than the rate at which Canada was growing at the same time, but in no single case was there any dependence on immigration. On the contrary, during these years there were large emigrations from nearly all these countries. In some years Great Britain sent abroad several hundred thousands of persons, yet at the same time her own population increased by leaps and bounds. The same is true of Germany. Both these countries standing square in the stream of modern industrial development and well placed geographically met all their multifarious demands for men from their own stores and had great abundance to spare. Their increase in population was directly due to the increase in their productive capacity and in their markets. So will it be with Canada. It is very easy to get the cart of population before the horse of production and this, unfortunately, is frequently done. People do not make jobs but jobs make people and if the number of jobs in this country increases rapidly in the future, we do not need to worry about there being plenty of people on hand to fill them. We have been curiously blind to this rather obvious fact in the past, and Canadians seem to have been oppressed by a fear that if they did not import people constantly and in large numbers, the country would not be adequately peopled.

Strange as it may seem, had we never had a single immigrant

come within our borders since Confederation, 63 years ago, it is probable that our population to-day would not be materially different from what it is. Save under exceptional and limited circumstances, immigration does not increase population. This seeming paradox is capable of proof and the proof lies in the fact that, except when we had large areas of vacant land to be filled up very quickly, our immigrant population simply displaced the native born. This is a process that has been happening for years in Canada and is happening to-day. During the decade of the 'eighties the natural increase of our population was between 800,000 and 900,000. We received therefore from both sources roughly one and three-quarter millions of people. Of these we retained about one-half million. As we must have retained some of the immigrants who came to us as well as some of our natural increase it is obvious that among those who left us were a great many of our native born. Probably as many as sixty or seventy per cent of the people born in Canada in the decade of the 'eighties left the country. The immigration of the 'eighties, therefore, was not an accession to the population; it was simply the exchange of one set of persons for another.

In the opening decade of the nineteenth century, there was an immigration of one million eight hundred thousand and a natural increase of eight hundred and fifty thousand. Yet there was an increase in total population of only one million eight hundred thousand. During this decade, therefore, we had eight hundred and fifty thousand people more than we could accommodate. Fortunately for ourselves we managed to export them. Since there was a substantial increase in the immigrant-born population of the country during that decade, it follows that the exports must have consisted very largely of native born.

During the five years 1921 to 1926, there came to the three prairie provinces about 180,000 immigrants. The natural

increase of the three provinces was about 150,000. Their total increase should have been 330,000, but it was only 111,000. It would appear, therefore, that 220,000 must have gone away. It is significant that a number equal to the whole 180,000 immigrants together with 40,000 of the people born in these provinces in the years 1921 to 1926 simply disappeared into space. It is known that every immigrant who came here during those years did not so disappear. Those who remained with us must therefore have pushed out an equivalent number of the native born. Once more, immigration had had no effect whatsoever in increasing population. It had simply dislocated it. The persons who were already here and who may be presumed to have spent time and money in learning to adapt themselves to this western country were replaced by persons who had not done these things but who would have to do them in the future. The same type of social adjustment which had already taken place would have to be repeated.

The country, in short, may be likened to a ship which can carry only a fixed number of people, crew and passengers. If she takes on a number of passengers in excess of her complement, there is only one way of compensating for it, some of the crew must be left behind. We in Canada for sixty years past have been taking on so many passengers, that is immigrants, that we have had to keep leaving many of the crew behind. To provide room in the ship of state for immigrants we have had to embark a large proportion of our own children for the voyage of life in another vessel, the good ship *United States*.

The objection may be raised that if we had not had immigration in our bad years our own people would have gone away and we should have had an actual decrease in population. This, however, will not stand. It has already been shown that the country's population is determined by its productions and the success it has in marketing them abroad. While a certain

number of people would have gone away, because we had more than we could use, this number would have only been sufficient to compensate for the adverse economic conditions of the period. Regardless of immigration during the period 1921-26, the population of the three prairie provinces in 1926 would have been the same.

The case against immigration then is, briefly, that immigration is unnecessary. Save under exceptional circumstances which are not likely to recur again, we have had and will have in this country sufficient man power to develop its resources. In five years out of six we have had more than sufficient man power, as is proved by the fact that we continuously export man power. We cannot use all the man power we have. We sent emigrants to the United States sixty years ago; we have sent them every year since and we are still sending them. The compensations we have received from American immigration can easily be shown to be small. Under these circumstances it would seem to be absurd to refer to Canada as an under-populated country. It is, in fact, most of the time over-populated. The existence of large open spaces is not synonymous with under-population. The Arctic lands, for example, are empty, but under present conditions, they are not under-populated. Nature seems to maintain a very nice balance between the number of people in a region and the number of people which that region can support. Let population rush up beyond the land's resources as it did in Ireland in the first half of the last century, and there comes the inevitable reckoning, emigration or starvation. Let a land be empty, as were the prairies a few years ago, and if men can get in, they come rolling in like a flood until it is filled. This country, since it has invariably more people than it can use, is therefore as a rule over-populated. We have been fortunate in having a great outlet for our surplus population so close at hand, otherwise we would soon experience the ills of over-population and

the more fortunate, as in England to-day, would be engaged in supporting the less fortunate.

Those who think we must bring in immigrants to compensate for our loss of population do so because they do not realize that the initial cause of the loss is the inability of the country at any given time to support the people who go away. Under these circumstances it is plain that immigration does not act as a cure for the disease but in fact aggravates it. Immigration into the country is not a compensation for the emigration of our own people from it, which every Canadian deplures, but itself is a cause of that emigration.

In the days of good Queen Bess, Sir Thomas Gresham, founder of the Royal Exchange, formulated the important monetary law which has since borne his name. "Cheap money will drive out dear money," said Sir Thomas, by which he meant that in times when the currency system is not satisfactory a depreciated currency will circulate and people will keep in their possession the sound money that comes their way. If he had directed his thought to immigration Sir Thomas might have stated his law thus: "Cheap men will drive out dear."

Everyone is familiar with this "Gresham's Law of Immigration", in its application to Orientals. The white labourer cannot compete with the Oriental and the only way to prevent the country being swamped by Asiatics is to limit their migration to our country. We are willing to admit the principle as applied to Asiatics because of a difference in colour. It is more difficult to grasp the application of the law to persons whose skin is the same colour as our own. But whether they be of different race or not, "cheap" men will always drive our "dear" men. The man with the higher standard of living cannot compete with the man with the lower. In this sense, virtually all immigrants are 'cheap' men for on arriving in this country they are not in a position to bargain for the sale of their labour. They must get a livelihood on

what terms they can. In this respect, people from the Mother Country differ from other immigrants only in degree. Their standard of living is higher than that of foreigners but it is not as high as that of the native born. If it were they would not emigrate. Thus they compete with the Canadian and innocently displace him in many walks of life. The result is that the people born in this country, because of competition with the immigrant, whether that immigrant be English-speaking or not, tend to go over the border in greater numbers than if there were no immigration.

The immigrant's handicap is the employer's advantage, for the employer gets a man who at all costs must hold his job. He may, probably, get a more highly skilled workman. Old-country craftsmen are better trained than Canadians; Canadians, on the other hand, receive a warm welcome in the United States for similar reasons. In the Motherland where jobs are few and a man dare not risk the loss of the one he has, a man must be efficient. In Canada, fear of being out of work is not so great and a willing person can always make a living in some manner. There is therefore a greater spirit of independence. In the United States, conditions have advanced a stage farther and, as a rule, one can not only get work but can find employment more or less to his liking. This tends to create a still greater independence on the part of the employed person, hence the warm welcome there to Canadians who are described as "reliable", which means, that coming from a land where opportunities are not as great as those in the United States, they are more afraid of losing their jobs than are the native-born Americans.

One may assume that Canadians wish to see Canada a nation and possessed of all the best attributes of nationhood. If it be true that the chief result of immigration is to drive out the native-born, much evil must come of this constant renewal of blood generation after generation. About one

million people, native born and immigrants, have left this country within the last six or seven years. That means that our population coming in by the front door of the St. Lawrence and going out by the back door of the International boundary is essentially shifting and unstable. A surprisingly large number of persons thus never get a chance to adapt themselves to the country. This state of permanent social dislocation does not promote the making by Canada of a contribution to the world's civilization worthy of her possibilities. A man has just nicely fitted himself into Canadian ways, he has begun to think in Canadian terms and to understand Canadian problems, when off he goes, or if he should remain his children, his more accurately adjusted self, leave our shores.

Wholesale immigration, productive as it is of wholesale emigration, turns our country into a training ground for American citizens. We instruct our new-comers in the ways of the continent, teach them, often at considerable pains, to fit themselves into our social structure; we educate their children at great expense to the state and then send them across the border. When they become American citizens, they are welcomed as highly manufactured products, finished at the expense of another country. Meanwhile we in Canada have brought in another batch of raw material which out of the goodness of our hearts we proceed to prepare for our American friends.

The enormous magnet to the south will always draw away some of our children but the only way in which we can resist its attractions will be by creating a drawing power of our own. It is possible that if our standard of living were not being continuously depressed by the arrival of the immigrant, opportunities would be relatively equal on both sides of the line. A continental rather than a national standard of living would then obtain and we would be more likely to retain all the population which our natural resources justify our having.

It seems plain that since we do not need immigration we should discontinue all the various attempts now being made to secure it. There should not be one cent of public money spent on securing immigrants of any type. Steamship transportation should be made not easier but more difficult. No one should be allowed to come here who does not come on his own initiative and even the immigration of this class of person should be selective.

For generations the Canadian people have been pursuing the will o' the wisp of immigration; for generations they have been telling themselves that theirs is an under-populated country, a country which year after year with monotonous regularity sends thousands of its citizens abroad! That it would be better to have a larger population is a point on which we are all agreed but we cannot lift ourselves by our bootstraps. As the world demands our products our population will grow and nature will add the cubit to our national stature which we by taking thought cannot acquire.

CURRENT EVENTS

THE CANADIAN ELECTION.

A few days before polling one of the most experienced of Canadian politicians—an observer of but not a participant in the campaign—was asked to forecast the result and he replied, “There is no record in the annals of North American politics of a party in office which tried for a new mandate in a period of business depression not being punished by the voters. The Government will be decisively beaten.” So it befell and the Conservative party is now installed in office with one of the largest majorities in its history. It is in a position of comfortable dominance in the Commons over any possible combination of opponents and the operations of mortality will soon provide it with a majority in the Senate.

The widespread discontent generated by the business depression and the resulting unemployment made a mass of voters responsive to the Conservative indictment of the King Ministry and the ancient battlecry of all oppositions, “Time for a change.” But other adverse factors were also in operation. The *Manitoba Free Press* has indulged in a stern criticism of the whole strategy which was responsible for an election in the month of July, 1930, and it has declared that “the manner in which Mr. Bennett played upon Mr. Mackenzie King’s pride, combativeness, and—perhaps—belief in his star in order to get him in the mood to fight a battle on ground chosen by his opponents, and under conditions which helped them to put him at a disadvantage, will doubtless be recorded in books on political strategy as a warning to future premiers.”

Then Mr. King got off to an unfortunate start in his speechmaking campaign by treating unemployment as a

trivial issue and although the turbulence of his western meetings brought a change of heart and an offer of coöperative assistance to municipal and provincial authorities in solving the unemployment problem, the mischief had been done. An impression had been created that he was indifferent to the fortunes of the unemployed, and men whose wives and children are crying for bread are hard to appease. The strong case which was available for the Dunning Budget, at least in the rural communities, was very ably presented by Mr. Dunning but many other prominent Liberals took the fatal rôle of timid apologists and failed to carry conviction with either friend or foe. New Zealand butter wrought deadly damage to the Liberals in every constituency where dairying was an important industry and, viewed in retrospect, it seems as if the arrangement whereby the duty on New Zealand butter was reduced to a cent per pound was a major political error. It is the province of intelligent statesmen to foresee some of the consequences of their acts and it should have been reasonably plain that under such a low tariff New Zealand butter was bound to enter in large quantities and equally bound to create an outcry among our dairymen which no Government and particularly no Liberal Government, dependent as it always largely is upon rural support, could withstand. Now Liberals are mourning lost legions in the dairying districts; the trade arrangements have been abrogated and New Zealand is nursing a bitter sense of grievance; resolutions are being passed in that Dominion advocating a boycott of Canadian goods and the prospects of the successful negotiation of a new treaty are not bright.

The great surprise of the election was the unexpected upheaval in Quebec which has given the Conservatives their largest Simon Pure representation from that province since 1891. Even confirmed Conservative optimists did not anticipate a gain of more than ten seats and Liberals talked blithely of

capturing some of the few outworks of their great fortress which the Conservatives already held. Now there are great breaches in its walls and the political solidarity of Quebec is a thing of the past. Mr. Gordon Henlerson, K.C., of Ottawa, in a letter to the *Ottawa Citizen* has advanced a dozen reasons for the unexpected change in the political sentiments of a multitude of French-Canadian voters and while some of them are now obvious, others are more obscure. Unemployment played its part in the cities; on the eve of the election it was aggravated by the action of a number of manufacturers who found some of the fruits of the Dunning Budget unpalatable in giving their workers a holiday and indicating that there was grave uncertainty about the future fortunes of a company so exposed to unjust foreign competition. In the country, and particularly in the Eastern Townships, the fatal New Zealand butter did its worst for the Ministry but it only aggravated a serious economic depression which for some years past has been gnawing at the heart of rural Quebec. In recent years the French-Canadian farmer, relying as he too often does upon primitive farming methods, has found it increasingly difficult to wrest a living for his family from his little holding; in numerous parishes the ratio of abandoned farms has been as high as 30% and the province of Quebec can show not a few transatlantic parallels to Goldsmith's "Sweet Auburn." The pulp and paper industry which has been a great source of supplementary income to the habitant is passing through dark and difficult days and its entrepreneurs have cut the price of pulpwood to a lowly figure. Furthermore, this year the stream of Americans, who in recent years have been spending their money so freely in Quebec, is much smaller as the result of the great stock market debacle and its aftermath in the United States. Such visitors as have come have been in an economical mood. All these factors combined to bring many farmers in Quebec to abandon their old mood of contentment

and encouraged the same spirit of querulous peevishness as has often afflicted their western brethren.

There is evidence, likewise, that the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church had become genuinely alarmed at the overt manifestations of strong anti-Catholic sentiment in the West as revealed by the emergence of a Canadian replica of the American Ku-Klux-Klan and the result of the last provincial election in Saskatchewan and had reached the decision that the time had come to give some quiet and judicious encouragement to adequate representations for French Canada in the councils of the Conservative party. The country curés who in many cases were grieving over diminished flocks and disposed to question the benefits of Liberal rule apparently received instructions to observe an attitude of strict neutrality during the campaign and faithfully obeyed orders with the result that on the Sunday before the election there was not, as on the eve of some recent contests, an epidemic of political sermons full of exhortations to the faithful to save Quebec from the tyranny of the hateful party which has enforced conscription. Mr. Bourassa, as did many another stern, unbending Nationalist, took very unkindly to Mr. King's new Imperialist fervours and, declining to aid the Liberals either with voice or pen, departed on a cruise to Labrador as soon as his own return by acclamation was assured. Last of all, the Liberal leaders in Quebec obviously took too much for granted and did not realize that, apart from the development of a variety of grievances, long tenure of power, especially when accompanied by selfish administration of patronage, invariably ends in an erosion of party strength. Veterans insisted upon running the organization to suit their own ideas and able young men, repressed and despairing of any future in the paternal political camp, deserted to the enemy lines. But only bigoted partisan Liberals need repine over the outcome

in Quebec for it is easily the most happy feature of the whole election.

In view of the flowing tide against them the Liberals, although losing a few seats on the balance, did relatively well in Ontario, and not only did Mr. Ferguson fail to deliver his promised quota of 70 seats to Mr. Bennett but he did not enhance his reputation as a political leader by the acidulated temper of his speeches. The prairie provinces have always been politically a more or less incalculable element and this year the severe agricultural depression resulting from the grain market impasse and the fall in grain prices had brought them to the same mood of discontented querulousness as induced them to turn and rend the Ministry of Mr. Meighen in 1921; western Ministers returning from the battlefield aver that the Ku Klux Klan was a more effective ally of the Conservatives than they thought possible. It was left to British Columbia, which the Conservatives regarded as a safe stronghold, to furnish the Liberals with their only balm of consolation but it was only natural that a great port like Vancouver should manifest a predilection for a tariff policy which would stimulate its shipping trade and certain basic local industries.

Post-mortems are now the favourite pastime of the political pundits but they are none the less unprofitable except as an academic diversion. Of infinitely more real interest is speculation about the future of the incoming Ministry and the different parties. If he has the courage to turn a deaf ear to the entreaties of certain soiled doves and notorious weaklings among his following who feel that they are indispensable to any Conservative Cabinet Mr. Bennett can construct a very presentable Ministry and, if he reinforces it with some of the political talent available in the provincial field, can let it begin its career with the blessing of the whole country and a fair field. He will need the most competent band of Ministers that he can possibly enlist for no easy task lies before him. He

enters office with a burden of pledges and commitments upon his shoulders such as no Canadian premier has ever assumed. He has promised to alleviate unemployment without any delay and he has committed himself to policies and enterprises whose aggregate cost to the public purse has been estimated at something not far short of a billion dollars. Yet revenues are falling at the rate of 75 million dollars and there is no sign of any real revival of general economic prosperity for his country. It becomes plainer every day that in common with every other country we are in the grip of a worldwide depression whose cure will be a slow and painful process and that there is no magic wand available for any Government to bring back prosperity and create employment for the workless. One distressing feature of the campaign was that in its whole course only one solitary politician, W. H. Moore, made even a half-hearted attempt to analyse the causes which have produced the business depression and consequent unemployment. It would indeed be a public spirited act for some generous citizen to present every member of the new Parliament with a copy of the illuminating memorandum written by Sir H. Strakosch and published in pamphlet form by the London *Economist* under the title of *Gold and the Price Level*.

Mr. Bennett, however, may be able to make out an arguable case for a stiff upward revision of the tariff. He will be able to contend with some justice that at a time when every industrial country is suffering from an overproduction of certain commodities which it cannot market profitably, it is fatal for Canada to keep a low standard of tariff schedules which make her a convenient dumping ground. He was extremely frank and explicit in his exposition of his tariff views and contemplated policies and he can justifiably claim that he has been given a mandate for a high tariff programme by the Canadian people.

It is reasonably certain that within a year the new Con-

servative Ministry will submit to Parliament a plan for a sharp upward revision of the tariff and it will have no difficulty in passing the necessary legislation. But in the end it will probably not realize the fond expectations of the high protectionist elements in the party. Mr. Bennett numbers among his followers 22 members elected from the prairie provinces and all of these are painfully aware of the unpopularity of high tariffs with their constituents. The arguments of the *Manitoba Free Press* and other western Liberal papers that in view of the severe competition in the international market for grain, it was a matter of life and death for the prairie farmers to keep their costs of production at the lowest possible level may not have salvaged many votes for their party, possibly because the increases in the iron and steel duties did not seem to conform with this thesis, but they are none the less sound and the prairie farmers and everybody whose fortunes are linked up with theirs will view with apprehension tariff proposals which augment the cost of raising grain. The western Conservative members will be painfully aware that if they countenance any rash upward revision of the tariff, their political careers may be brief. It is a safe calculation that in the Conservative caucus they will fight strenuously to restrain protectionist excesses on the part of their eastern brethren. Furthermore, when the Ministry comes to tackle the tariff, it will find itself confronted by the old difficulty that the finished product of one industry is raw material for another. A considerable proportion of our industries are of the secondary type and many of them will be wholly averse to tariff changes which may benefit primary producers like the iron and steel plants but will certainly raise the costs of secondary production and make it more difficult for them to hold their domestic market. Mr. Bennett, if he wanted to, cannot avoid pushing the tariff upward but his revision is not likely to bear

any resemblance to the protectionist extravagances lately indulged in by the Labour Ministry in Australia.

In Parliament the Bennett Ministry cannot expect to have matters all its own way for it will be confronted by an Opposition exceptionally strong in debating and critical power. The only serious election casualty among the leaders of Liberalism was Mr. Dunning and in the interests of his party and the nation it is to be hoped that immediate steps will be taken to restore him to Parliament. Now while the election may have cost the Liberals the sweets of office it has also been as healthy a purge as ever a party experienced. Liberal orators have been wont to talk grandiloquently about their party being a many-mansioned house in which there was room for a wide divergence of views and certainly there has been no lack of diversity of economic opinions among its adherents who ranged from extreme free traders to high protectionists. In actuality since 1921 the King Ministry's hold upon power has been derived from a coalition of a Quebec bloc which contained a core of ingrained conservatism and the progressive elements who under different nomenclatures have dominated the political life of the prairie provinces since their organization. To-day the conservative protectionists in Quebec have suddenly hived off to the party to which they properly belong and which could not prosper without their support. There has thus been a great deliverance for Liberalism and it should be possible for the party to acquire a cohesion for its ideas and policies which has been woefully lacking for many years.

Mr. Bennett's "Canada First" policy must obviously have a strong appeal to a province in which nationalist sentiment is so strong and if he perseveres with it he has a good prospect of increasing his political strength in Quebec in the coming years. As a consequence, the Liberals, who are now committed to a policy of Imperial coöperation in trade, must look more and more to Ontario and the West for the restoration of their

political fortunes. The party can no longer be faced with the charge that it is held in bondage to Quebec and, if led with ability and courage, it can reasonably expect a steady increment of support from the Maritime provinces, Ontario and Quebec, while the election returns showed that its policies were popular in British Columbia. But if it is not vouchsafed the bold and resolute leadership which the situation demands, nothing is more certain than that there will be a resurgence of the Progressive movement in the prairie provinces. At present Progressivism seems to have fallen upon evil days but its representatives in Parliament are still of a high average quality and the conditions which make for the development of agrarian political insurgency are not liable to be banished for some years. Imperial relations in the sphere of trade were a subject of continuous controversy during the election and there was revealed a sharp divergence of opinion between the two historic parties. It has been plain for some time that there has been in the past two years an ebbing of the tide of nationalist sentiment which began to flow strongly during the Great War through the conviction that the leading strings of Downing Street were no longer tolerable for Canada and that if we have ever again to sacrifice so much blood and treasure the responsibility for the policies which entailed the sacrifices must reside with our own statesmen. The process of emancipation from the tutelage of London has been steadily pushed ahead by Conservative and Liberal Ministries but a feeling has been growing that separatist tendencies were being carried too far by Mr. King and his colleagues. There is still a basic passion running through the national mind of Canada to keep the Dominion as a repository of the British tradition on this continent and the realization has grown that extreme nationalism will not achieve this so easily as the perpetuation of the present partnership in the British Commonwealth. Hence it is that while there is no inclination to retrace the steps in national

emancipation which have been taken, the view has gained favour that the time has come to lay stress upon the nationalist ideal and to give some thought to policies which might safeguard the permanence of the structure of the Commonwealth. During the election there was a certain competition in Imperialist zeal between the leaders of the two major parties and both have professed a whole-hearted devotion to the idea that at all costs the British Commonwealth must be preserved intact.

But there is now a fundamental difference in their attitude to the problem of Imperial coöperation. The Liberals while firm that complete autonomy in the political sphere must be preserved are ready for practical measures of trade coöperation but the Conservatives, while willing to coöperate in the spheres of politics and defence, are insistent that there must be no sacrifice of Canada's industrial interests for the sake of the possible enhancement of the general fortunes of the Commonwealth. Mr. Bennett will go to the forthcoming Imperial Conferences committed to a nationalist-protectionist policy and it is understood that his old friend Lord Beaverbrook, regarding him as an enemy of his "free trade within the Empire" projet, has turned his portrait to the wall. Mr. Bennett has also pledged himself to demand as a *quid pro quo* for the British preferential concessions of the Canadian tariff reciprocal preferential favours for Canadian produce but with Mr. Snowden at the Exchequer he cannot cherish any serious hopes of being able to induce the MacDonald Ministry to impose food taxes for the benefit of the Dominions. Mr. MacDonald and his colleagues evidently sense the need of some kind of Imperial trade policy and the latest news is that they intend to submit to the Conferences a scheme for the bulk purchase of Dominion foodstuffs. Presumably they intend to include in it some sort of practical preference for the Dominions but the details of the plan are not yet available. It will obviously

constitute a tremendous adventure in collectivism and it may place the leader of a Canadian Conservative party in a very embarrassing position. If he agrees to participate in the scheme he will assuredly offend powerful commercial interests in Canada and if he rejects it, he can expect a fierce outcry of protest from the prairie provinces. Time was not long ago when Mr. Bennett was counted one of the most perfervid and, in some eyes, dangerous Imperialists in Canada, but now he is faced with the problem of refuting the amusing charge of the *Toronto Globe* that he is nothing more than a Canadian "Sinn Feiner."

The new orientation of parties should bring new health to Federal politics in Canada but it may also coincide with a diminution of their relative importance. In the United States there has been a noticeable tendency to increase and aggrandise the powers of the Federal authority, and the new Labour Ministry in Australia has been credited with plans to obliterate the six state governments and substitute a unified political structure for the whole country. But in Canada the tendency in a contrary direction has been very marked since the war. The provincial administrations have been allowed and encouraged to assume more and more responsibilities; the Federal government has lately divested itself of control of the natural resources of the three prairie provinces and it has as a corollary shelved the responsibility for immigration policies to the provincial governments. The Railway Department has ceased to be anything but a watchdog over the Canadian National system and the King Government was moving in the direction of an abdication of any claim to regulate waterpowers save in their navigation aspects. Again, the late Ministry disclaimed direct responsibility for a problem like unemployment, and, while it gives financial assistance in connection with old age pensions, their administration is left to the provinces. As a consequence Federal politics are becoming more and more

restricted in their scope; foreign affairs, which have rarely heretofore absorbed more than three days of each parliamentary session, may and ought to enlist greater attention from our parliamentarians, but apart from them they will in the coming years have to expend their energies mainly on sectional squabbles about the tariff and bickerings about patronage and public works.

Ottawa will have less attraction than ever for public-spirited citizens who are interested in the fundamental social and economic problems because it will not be the scene of their settlement, and there may come a realization that the administrative and political structure which has been built up around the seat of Federal authority is extravagantly large for the work with which it is charged. But a diminution of Federal power may also contain certain perils for a country which is rent by so many geographical, economic and racial cleavages as is the Dominion of Canada.

HAMILTON FYFE OF QUEEN'S.

My only qualification for attempting to offer some appraisal of Mr. Hamilton Fyfe, the new Principal of Queen's University, is that I have probably known him longer than anybody else in Canada. Away back in the winter of 1896 when I was a very small boy at Fettes College in Edinburgh, Dr. Heard, the headmaster, one afternoon pounced upon me as I was playing in front of the schoolhouse and asked me to take a telegram to Fyfe, the head boy of Kimmerghame House. I had previously known him by sight from afar as an Olympian school prefect, but now I made his personal acquaintance in the rôle of a Ganymede who bore good tidings. The telegram contained word that he had been elected to an open classical postmastership at Merton College—certain scholarships there are called postmasterships—and this

was the beginning of a friendship which has grown deeper and stronger with the passing years and been sustained by correspondence across the estranging seas.

Naturally I moved in much lowlier circles than did Fyfe at school, and as he left at the end of my first year I knew him in those days but slightly. He was not one of the great athletic heroes of the school, but he as easily the best scholar of his year and he was popular alike with boys and masters. And his election to Merton established a connection between Fettes and that college which resulted in my going up to it five years later. By this time Fyfe had covered himself with academic glory by taking a double first; he had been as at school one of the most popular undergraduates of his time, and evidence of this is to be found in the fact that in his last year he was elected to the Presidency of the Junior Common Room. When I got to Oxford in October, 1902, Fyfe had accepted an appointment as a master at Radley, a well-known public school which lies some ten miles east of Oxford on the Thames. There we resumed the acquaintance which had begun at Fettes and scarcely a week passed that he did not visit Merton, while on Sundays I used to walk over to Radley.

During my time at Oxford I knew a number of Radleians who had been under Fyfe, and they all testified to his merits as a teacher and his qualities as a friend. He was obviously too good a man to remain long an assistant schoolmaster, and in 1904 on the retirement of the senior classical tutor at Merton, Mr. G. F. Scott, Fyfe was brought back to his old college as classical tutor. At the end of his first year he was made Dean which made him responsible for the discipline of the college and *custos morum* of the undergraduate body. My recollections of him at Merton are very vivid. He was extraordinarily youthful looking for a don, and he obviously felt it would be incongruous for him to assume the airs of a venerable savant as young Oxford dons have been known to do. He

was a good classical tutor who had a real zest for the nuances of classical scholarship, and at the same time had the gift of being able to impart his lore. As a dean he was liberal-minded, just and conscientious, and he was always ready to make allowances for the follies of youth provided they did not take the form of rowdy vulgarity. He mingled freely with the undergraduates, and was constantly giving breakfast or luncheon parties in his rooms; he attended the meetings of debating and literary clubs in the college and he took an abiding interest in its fortunes on the field and river. About once a month he would collect two or three of us who hailed from his old school and with the pronouncement "Here I cease to be Dean of Merton and become an old Fettesian," he would settle down to hold high converse until the small hours of morning.

From 1904 onwards William Fyfe was the life and soul of Merton College. He did a great deal of tutorial work, he played an active part in college administration and he was the guide, philosopher and friend of all the undergraduates. In the wider life of the university he also busied himself in various directions; he was one of the leaders of a group of reformers who were persistently battling with the conservative elements in order to bring Oxford's educational methods and standards into conformity with a world in whose life science was playing an increasing part. He was also editor of the Oxford University Magazine and its files will reveal that if he had not been a don he would have been as eminent a journalist as his brother Henry is. When the Great War came Fyfe, although he had no previous military experience, at once offered his services in any capacity, but he proved so competent an instructor that he was retained at Oxford on the training staff of the O. T. C.

Fyfe remained in Oxford till the war was over, but in 1919 there came to him an offer of the headmastership of Christs Hospital, better known as the "Bluecoat School," from

the peculiar cloaks which its scholars always wear. It was an old and famous foundation which bears on its bead-roll of honour many illustrious names, Charles Lamb, Leigh Hunt, and David Thompson the explorer, being a few of the best known. About the beginning of the present century it had sold its ancient buildings in the heart of the City of London for a large sum, and with the proceeds had re-established itself on the Sussex Downs near Horsham in a rural atmosphere. Christs Hospital is a school almost *sui generis*; every one of the boys is a scholar who on being elected to the foundation is entitled to tuition and board free of charge. Rich men's sons never enter its doors, and its pupils are drawn from every grade of English society. Parents, since they are not paying for their sons' education, are powerless to interfere with cranky protests or extravagant demands, and as a result the headmaster has a free hand which many of his compeers envy.

When Fyfe took over Christs Hospital, its great pride was its classical tradition, and upon perpetuation of its glories the whole energies of the place were concentrated. Fyfe, however, realized that his boys, most of whom had scant pecuniary resources, must go out and make their way by their own brains and energy in a world where an erudite knowledge of Thucydides or Catullus was only an asset in very restricted spheres, and he set himself to broaden the scope of the school's curriculum. He gave every boy a certain rudimentary training in the classics, but would only encourage such as showed a peculiar aptitude for it to specialize in this branch of learning. For the rest he opened up new avenues of educational activity; he developed the science and modern language sides, he set up an engineering shop and he made available instruction in different branches of art. Having some spare land at his disposal, he established a small farm in connection with the school and boys who had a taste for a farming career at home or in the Dominions were able to acquire some rudimentary training in

agriculture. This last was a very successful experiment and in recent years an annual contingent of "Bluecoat" boys has come to Canada; many of them have supplemented their preliminary training with courses at Macdonald College before they went farming on their own account. As a consequence of this interesting enterprise Fyfe has been a valuable recruiting agent for Canada and starts with a goodly band of young friends in all parts of our Dominion. Winning scholarships at the Universities is perhaps not a complete test of a school's success or failure, but if it is, Christs Hospital since the war could claim to be one of the most efficient and progressive schools in Britain. As such it was recognized by all the educational experts in the mother country, and Fyfe had come to rank as one of the best of the younger headmasters of the great schools of England.

Sooner or later he was assured of translation to some even more responsible post, and among his Merton friends there was a general desire that he should close his educational career as Warden of Merton. When he came to this country on his first visit last April, he had not the slightest idea of being Principal of Queen's or any other Canadian University; he was simply an observant and interested visitor who was having his first real holiday for some years and was determined to combine enjoyment with an acquisition of knowledge about Canada's educational system and general conditions. The offer of the Principalship came to him without any solicitation or effort of any kind on his part; indeed it was a complete surprise that he should even have been considered for it. From the first the idea attracted him but he had to consult other interested parties, not least of all his wife. However, he had fallen in love with Canada and he saw before him a sphere of exceptional usefulness. So he made known his willingness to become Principal of Queen's University, and in due course the trustees

unanimously ratified the decision of the Committee which had recommended him.

So William Hamilton Fyfe becomes Principal of Queen's at the age of 52, in the prime of life. He is the first Principal who is an alumnus of an English University, and there has been some shaking of heads at what is regarded as a break with the old ingrained tradition of Queen's, that some sort of Scottish flavour is an indispensable ingredient in the character of all good Principals and Professors. Now Principal Fyfe may have received his university education at Oxford and spent most of his adult life in England, but he is essentially a Scot. The name Fyfe, indeed, betokens that some of his forbears hailed from the shire of Fife on the east coast of Scotland, and I have heard him call himself a "whistling Fifer." His grandfather was a native of Kirriemuir in Forfarshire, the little moorland town to which the genius of Barrie has given worldwide fame and his family have always maintained their Scottish ties. He himself, also, spent the seven most formative years of his life at school in Edinburgh, and the Scots Doric is a tongue which he can understand. There, therefore, need be no fear that the Scots Presbyterian traditions of Queen's will suffer in his hands.

It is difficult to write without kindly bias of such an old friend as Principal Fyfe, but I feel confident that the trustees of Queen's will never regret their choice and will have reason to plume themselves on their wisdom in the coming years. The new Principal is not only a scholar of fine quality and an educationalist of ripe experience and acknowledged eminence, but he is a man of real intellectual distinction whose interests are as wide as his time allows. He is no angular pedant with a single track mind but a cultivated man of the world whose opinions on politics, literature, social problems or art are always worth hearing. Not the least admirable of his qualities are his even temper and his keen sense of humour, and while

he is not addicted to social gaieties he is the best of company either as a host or guest. But as Principal perhaps his most useful asset will be his perennial sympathy with youth and its dreams and aspirations; his hair has grown grey since I first knew him more than thirty years ago, but he has retained in a singular degree the *élan* of youth and in his composition there is no trace of *blasé* cynicism. It is by no means an easy thing for a man of fifty to wrench himself away from a familiar environment and all his friends and undertake new duties in a far-off land even if it owns allegiance to the same flag as his native country, and the new Principal must be allowed time to find his feet. But find them he will, and he will not waste much time in the task. He is fortunate too in being able to bring with him to Queen's a charming wife, the sister of an intimate friend of his Fettes days, and two sons and a daughter who have blessed their union.

J. A. STEVENSON.

BOOK REVIEWS

WHEAT.

Wheat. By W. W. Swanson and P. C. Armstrong. Toronto: 1930. Macmillan; xiv, 322 pp. \$3.00.

The Bread of Britain. By A. H. Hurst. Oxford: 1930; 90 pp. \$1.00.

What an international commodity and world-wide economic force wheat is! Pick up your newspaper and you see such titles as "Wheat and Mussolini," "Danube Basin as a Wheat Producer," and every day there is speculation as to Argentine and Australian crops, concern over European tariffs, and rumours as to vague and dangerous possibilities in India and Russia. We are less confident now than we were as to our being the world's bread basket. The knowledge that prosperous France is raising and consuming within its borders as great a crop as we grow, also of her phenomenal immigration, and her rapidly developing wheat growing areas in her North African colonies, upsets all our parish-pump theories. Consequently, a book on "Wheat" by an economist, Dr. W. W. Swanson, and by a technical agriculturist, P. C. Armstrong, is more than welcome. The book provides a useful sketch of the growth of wheat farming in Western Canada, the transportation systems, the co-operative movements, grain inspection and regulation, and the world market.

As we read we come to realize that wheat is a commodity of which we know much and little. The production side is familiar to us in Western Canada, but how often we forget even our own memories on the consumption side. The influx into the towns and cities of Great Britain and Northern Ire-

land established bread and tea as the two articles on which no Chancellor of the Exchequer could impose duties with impunity. The tea, after the 10 hour day, was the evening meal at which as high as 80 per cent of all the food eaten was derived from grain—soda scones, wheaten bread, white bakers' bread, oat cakes, a potato bread in which flour was used. A rigid convention established the order in which a small boy endured the agonies of Tantalus impatiently, whilst he got through the slices of plain bread, the scones, the ginger bread, to the delectable cake-end of the meal. The dumplings, the Yorkshire and bread puddings all made use of flour—which even provided the wall paper paste and the dressing for yarn.

In France, as in Britain, bread was important. Every revolution in France was dominated by bread. One recalls the famous march of the women to Versailles in search of "*le boulanger, la boulangère et le petit mitron*"—even the language in which they described Louis XVI, Marie Antoinette and the Dauphin, being coloured by their need for bread, a need which had brought the suggestion from Maria Antoinette that they eat cake if they had no bread. On Danton's statue in the Boulevard St. Germain there is this sentence born of this pre-occupation of the people with their main dietary article: "After bread, education is the first need of a people." Even to-day the French housewife judges her cost of living by the price of bread and the "*boulangerie*" with its yards of bread is still playing its historic premier rôle in the life of the people. Indeed the significance of this adherence of France to tradition is a striking example of how she refuses to follow so-called progress in other countries. The importance of flour in the macaroni and spaghetti of Italy is well known. Tradition has thus played a great part in establishing bread as an essential of life, but science is playing a greater part in breaking down this traditional acceptance of bread as the first article of diet of the artisan the world over.

The student of international trade and commerce is familiar with conditions abroad which are sharper in their contrasts than those to which we are accustomed, and knows how subtle are the forces that make or mar the economic satisfactions or even the livelihoods of whole populations; it is his duty, therefore, when he can, to moderate facile optimism or unjustified pessimism alike springing from parochial or narrow occupational viewpoints. One of the services rendered by these authors is the emphasis placed on the fact that Canada is much the largest single exporter of wheat, contributing no less than 35 to 40 per cent of all the wheat which enters international commerce, and also the outstanding point that in the movement of our grain to market "when it reaches the head of the Lakes at Fort William or Port Arthur or while it is in the elevator at a Georgian Bay port or Port Colborne or even after it is in the elevator at Montreal, it is essentially in *international* commerce." It is true that Great Britain is our best customer but we sell to her largely *indirectly* through the United States, a striking example of our wheat following the beaten track of trade across the lakes and across the Atlantic. The general flow of international trade and the volume of acceptances by banks and acceptance houses as between Great Britain and United States exert influences on price little understood except by those whose fingers are on the pulse of the complex machinery of international credit adjustments. Perhaps wisely the authors have not pushed their study into this difficult field, and we await further contributions. The aspect of this problem which needs study is the place of wheat in world commerce as the kind of cargo whose shipment can be used conveniently and without great risk of deterioration in international transactions. The merchant in Great Britain settling bills all over the world by diverting shipments to any port, the ship broker chartering cargoes, and the banker discounting bills, all are concerned with

this commodity which in many ways takes the place of gold as a means of discharging international obligations. There is a partial analogy between wheat in the bin to-day and gold in the vault in pre-war days. A thrifty banker seeks to prevent immobilization of gold as much as possible. His object is to put to work as much as he can of his available stock of gold for the creation of credit, to meet external drain, or international emergencies. Hoarded gold like hoarded wheat in any one country restricts the flow of credit and trade in every other. A boom in United States draws gold from all over the world since the high tariff wall precludes investors settling their accounts by goods. Similarly France to-day has been drawing gold from Great Britain and United States and her bankers will find it difficult to avoid credit stimulation, inflation and rising prices while the rest of the world suffers from falling prices. Unfortunately for us both United States and Great Britain are suffering from falling prices. Wheat, it should be noted, is an international means of settling accounts as well as an article which is bought for consumption. On this side we wish our authors had said more but they have started us to think.

As to the question of the Wheat Pools and the Grain Exchange which are related to this problem directly, the writers might be open to the charge of being somewhat like the people of whom Newman said "they can hold the balance between opposites so skilfully as to do without fulcrum or beam and never enunciate a truth without guarding themselves against being supposed to exclude the contradictory." They recognize, however, as every realist must, that the Wheat Pool is an economic fact, a great social movement and a very important and perhaps even an inevitable factor in marketing; hence complaints and anathemas are futile. But they rightly point out that the Pool, though a great co-operative body, must reckon with individualistic methods and incentives in an

intensely capitalistic commercial world market. As an organization holding wheat for sale and displacing a large number of private middlemen or traders it has withdrawn from the world market large quantities of a commodity on which traders reared a structure of balancing credits, for the private trader normally bought for sale and when he sold 'hedged.' The contraction therefore of this long series of credits and the weighting of the selling activity whilst probably assisting the stabilization of price has had a similar effect as the deflationary policy of a Central Bank, in that greater carry-over stocks are probably an unavoidable and permanent feature of this new orientation of the marketing of our grain. The remedy for this may be the creation in Europe of large buying corporations (publicly controlled or the result of cartellization of the milling industry), so as to balance the scale, or the release of grain to a large number of private traders in Europe, who as agents would find it remunerative to sell Canadian wheat.

Mr. Hurst in *The Bread of Britain* directs attention to this phase of the problem. 'Basic changes have taken place in both the supply situation and the demand situation in respect of wheat, and . . . as a result, it is necessary to adopt a wholly different manner of facing the volume of supplies and the directions of demands.' As the result of the operation of the selling pools free competition in the marketing of wheat no longer obtains. The concentration of buying resulting from the process of combination by which 62% of the milling industry is in the hands of three large units has further disturbed the marketing system by virtually eliminating the grain merchant who 'reduced the intensity of fluctuations in price' and 'smoothed price levels.' These changes effected in the methods of selling and of buying wheat, in Mr. Hurst's opinion, have 'deprived Great Britain of the certainty of a wheat reservoir,' have 'raised the price of bread generally out of proportion to cost, because of the need for insuring against intensified specu-

lation in the primary markets. The elimination of the grain merchant has, likewise, caused great injury to British trade, baking, and shipping by reducing competition for ocean freights.' Mr. Hurst argues that the government must intervene to see 'that the services formerly exclusively rendered by the grain merchant shall not be lost to the country' and urges the formation of a board 'comprising some of the best men in the trade, controlling the importation of wheat as well as the already trustified milling industry.'

The wholesale co-operative societies and the proposals of Mr. Wise show a trend of opinion in favour of the creation of large buying corporations. The organization of the British millers into a "cartel" may eventuate in a more cautious buying policy. It may be of interest to quote some of the main provisions of the Miller's Mutual Association, which as far as I know have not been published:

- "1. Any undertaking which manufactures flour in England and Wales will be eligible for membership."
- "2. All flour manufactured by members will be included within the scope of the scheme, except:—
 - (a) Any flour delivered outside England and Wales.
 - (b) Any flour delivered to Coöperative Societies.Flour coming under the heading of (a) or (b) will be termed "excluded flour." All other flour manufactured by members will be termed "included flour."
- "3. In order to enable members to increase their respective outputs, and thus run their mills nearer to full time, the Association will purchase and silence mills wherever possible. The outputs of such purchased mills will be allocated pro rata among the members."
- "4. Each member will select his total deliveries of flour either for the calendar year 1926, or for the calendar year 1927, and, after subtracting "excluded flour" therefrom, the net figure will form his basic datum.

The year decided upon by each member will be called his "elected Year."

- "5. In no case will the basic datum be allowed to exceed the normal output of the mill for a year's run of 6,000 hours. If the total deliveries during the selected year, after subtracting therefrom the deliveries of excluded flour, are more than 6,000 times the average hourly output, the excess over this quantity will be ignored in fixing the basic datum."
- "6. Each member will receive a Certificate of Membership and will pay:
- (a) An admission fee of £1 for each 5,000 sacks or part thereof which form his basic datum.
 - (b) A first premium of 6d. per sack on his basic datum.
 - (c) A Continuing Premium during the operation of the Scheme of 3d. per sack on his deliveries of "included flour," i.e., flour delivered in England and Wales, with the exception of deliveries to Co-operative Societies."
- "7. The First Premium Account will be used mainly for the purchase of mills, but this Account must be restored to its full total from the Continuing Premiums of 3d. per sack before any distribution of assets is made to the members. In any case, no distribution of any assets will be made within the first two years."
- "8. The Certificate of Membership will cover a period of ten years from the commencement of the Scheme."
- "9. Any member whose deliveries of "included flour" during any year exceed his datum for the time being in force must pay a premium on the excess deliveries of:—
- 1s. 0d. per sack for any excess up to 2 per cent above his datum.
 - 1s. 6d. per sack for any excess between 2 per cent and 3 per cent.
 - 2s. 6d. per sack for any excess between 3 per cent and 5 per cent.
 - 5s. 0d. per sack for any excess beyond 5 per cent."

- “10. Statistics in regard to deliveries, stocks, etc., will be supplied regularly by each member to the Association but such statistics, except in the aggregate, will be regarded as strictly confidential by the Association's officials, but not divulged either to the Board or to any member. The Board will periodically send an Accountant to inspect the books of members in order to check the declarations and statements which have been rendered by them.”
- “11. All members will undertake not to retain or acquire any monetary interest in any flour mills in England and Wales which are owned or controlled by non-members, unless such mills are at once brought within the scheme. Members will undertake also not to dispose of their mills to non-members unless such sales are accompanied by restrictions which safeguard the interests of the other members.”
- “12. The Board of Management will consist of seven members. The four following areas will appoint annually one member each:
- The North West.
 - The North East.
 - The South West.
 - The South East.
- The fifth member of the Board will be elected annually by the members whose mills have a capacity of less than eight sacks per hour, although the person so elected need not be necessarily one whose mill is of less than eight sacks per hour capacity.”
- “13. Voting at general meetings will be by a show of hands, but any member can demand a ballot and upon such ballot being taken each member will be entitled to one vote for every 50,000 sacks or part thereof comprised in his datum.”

The fines for exceeding the “datum” are severe, so that this scheme will undoubtedly tend to restrict production of flour to the market possibilities. Already we have sketched the importance of flour in the life of the British people a generation ago. Does that hold to-day? In Scotland there may be

a demand for a quality flour in which Canadian wheat will be an important ingredient. In the North of England the depression in the great staple industries will tend to be reflected in the lessened ability of England to purchase cotton and wheat in North America.

Moreover, improvement in the standard of living which is marked all over Europe does not mean increased consumption of cereals. The dissemination of knowledge about vitamins, class-room disparagement of starchy foods, and the dictates of fashion, have relegated flour products to a minor place and substituted eggs, vegetables, dairy products, fruit and meat. In the relatively prosperous South of England, the steady supply of fresh vegetables from France, the Channel Islands, Belgium and Holland, supplement their market gardens. Apart too from the purely commercial truck gardening, the impetus given to allotment gardening has not spent itself and the most remarkable feature of suburban development in England is the number of houses with sufficient garden space where the town worker grows a few vegetables. Denmark and Poland send butter, eggs and other produce, South America chilled meat, New Zealand lamb and mutton. England therefore demands as a supplementary item from her bakers a cheap loaf from blended flours, for this generation knew the bread of war days, and has no taste for a loaf made from straight Manitoba flour. Fifty per cent of Manitoba is about the maximum British millers will use in their blending and last year they used much less, whereas some years ago London millers used from 80 to 90 per cent Manitoba. Nor can we count on an increasing population in Great Britain. Tariff walls have been raised against the importation of wheat into Italy, Germany and France, and the English wheat grower has bitter things to say of the dumping of Continental grain in England.

Certainly the West is challenged by this changing international situation. How can it be met? Some advocate reduced acreage, a somewhat impracticable expedient, others diversification of farm production, while some see in mechanization the solution of our difficulties. Reduced acreage will not increase a diminishing international gold supply causing falling prices, nor can we make the producer in other countries accept a datum such as the British millers accept under their association. As to mechanization, which displaces horses and men and the market for coarse grain crops, have we ever considered the indebtedness of Western Canada already for road transportation and motor traction—(this in addition to more mileage of railway per head than anywhere else in the world)—and the growing yearly toll for petrol?

In the United States it has been estimated that the farm population declined from 28,980,000 in January, 1925, to 27,511,000 in January, 1929. The drift naturally flows to the cities. It is a phenomenon that we are beginning to experience here but we need not despair.

An acute foreign observer who has spent some years in Western Canada contrasted the farmers there with those in Europe, and remarked on the sound common sense and practical intelligence with which the Western farmer approaches questions. We have in Western Canada many kinds and classes of people—the enterprising type who profit by “boom” conditions and many thrifty, industrious settlers who regard speculation as of doubtful morality. The racial mixture some deplore in Western Canada is a guarantee that the West has the inherited skills of a continent with which to correct methods or change its farm products to meet new demands, and in a large number of cases the staying power to resist depression and carry over the bad spots. But our specialists in marketing, finance, and international trade must be grown along with our wheat. Occupational fitness applies to this field as

to that of agriculture and farmers' marketing tours and dissemination of news as to other countries, enable us to correct any local prejudices and to take the world as it is—a world in which our customers in Europe think, count, and buy—in many diverse ways.

ROBERT ENGLAND.

THREE POETS: LAMPMAN, THIRLMERE, PERCY

Archibald Lampman, Canadian Poet of Nature. By Carl Y. Connor. New York and Montreal: Louis Carrier & Company. 1929. Pp. 209. \$3.00.

Panorama. By Rowland Thirlmere. Stratford-upon-Avon; The Shakespeare Head Press. 1930. Pp. 119. 6s.

Selected Poems. By William Alexander Percy. New Haven, Conn.: The Yale University Press. 1930. Pp. 255. \$3.00.

Every poet does his exercise work (consider Wordsworth), and every poet must be the better for editing; yet he earns his poethood even though his exercise work should prove out of proportion to his essential work (consider Whitman), even though he only sometimes or rarely realizes all his resources of courage and ardour and drives his Pegasus with determined mastery along the rainbow road. The true poet has always the poet's feeling,—less often, alas! the poet's felicity.

Archibald Lampman knew his high moments. "Here, after all, is my best work," he said of his sonnets, and we can accept this judgment when we read *Love-Doubt*, *Among the Orchards*, *The Largest Life*, and the second of the sonnet-sequence called *The Frogs*... Dr. Duncan Campbell Scott's Introduction to Lampman's *Lyrics of Earth, Sonnets and Ballads* is the word of an intimate friend, a fellow-poet, and a conscientious editor; and there are also other critical appraisals of Lampman—as Dr. Archibald MacMechan's—that do him

substantial justice. The present volume is chiefly useful for its biographical information. On the critical side, it hesitates and wanders. Dr. Connor is a Canadian with American experience, who is now Professor of English at Sweet Briar College, Virginia. He writes of Lampman with a good deal of sympathy, but with no very definite conviction of his literary status. The book is poorly organized and loosely written, and suggests the academic thesis rather than the humane inquiry. "In the very short time," wrote Sidney Lanier, "that I have been in the hands of the critics, nothing has amazed me more than the timid solitudes with which they rarefy in one line any enthusiasm they may have condensed in another, . . . forever conciliating the yet-unrisen ghosts of possible mistakes."

Between Lampman and Lanier, indeed, there is in several respects a rather striking kinship. Both loved and practised the sonnet-form (although Lampman said of Lanier's sonnets that they sank under the weight of their intricate imagery); both had Western European forbears; both covered about the same span of life; both disliked the commercial spirit and were poor in worldly goods; both (but especially Lanier) were musical; both, as nature-poets, delighted in trees and birds; both celebrated Light and Heat; both were Christ-lovers; both disliked fundamentalism; both deeply admired Keats; both eagerly explored the secrets of tone-colour. They show a remarkable similarity in personal temper and poetic endowment, and a study of these relationships might be made to the advantage of both.

The English poet of the three we are now considering is John Walker, who uses the pen-name of "Rowland Thirlmere." He has published several volumes of creditable and more than creditable verse, of which *Panorama* impresses us as richest and best. Three of the poems it includes appeared in

the QUEEN'S QUARTERLY for Spring, 1930. The man who could write the exquisite *Praise of Love*, the subtly imaginative *Landscape in Another World*, and the impressive *Dark Portal* (especially its third stanza) is a true and fine poet. Other conspicuously good poems are *Mercédes Accounts for Herself*, *Light Out of Darkness*, *Fulfilment*, *Spring Morning* (and its complement, *Morning in Late Autumn*), *To a Musician*, and *Bach's Mass in B Minor*. Rowland Thirlmere has a deep sympathy for the various forms of natural beauty, and he knows also how to humanize his song. During the Great War he wrote the poem *Gassed*, touching the inner life of a blinded soldier. In the present volume *Sightless* reveals an even more sensitive understanding of the spirit of a 'dark' one.

Panorama embraces five sections—Poems of Reflection, Love Poems, Miscellaneous Lyrical Poems, Poems from the Japanese, and Caprices. The first group show marked imaginative power as planetary, firmamental poems. This and the second group contain the most ambitious and the most successful poems in the book. Of the shorter lyrics many are noteworthy for the intenseness of their thought and the grace of their style. One pauses with pleasure before such phrases as these:

. as a star
Trembles through tarnished cloud, she came.
Visible heaven had hemmed us round.
The slow mutations of the mothering soil.
Shy phantoms of bright words are caught. . . .

Especially harmonious and beautiful are the third and fourth stanzas of *The Carillon*, the twelfth of *Fulfilment*, the sixth of *Birth of a Cloud*, and the fourth of *Landscape*. Of the Poems from the Japanese, *Autumnal Sketch* and *Increment* seem the most memorable. *Board of Directors* in Caprices is a vivid bit of portraiture.

Panorama is, then, what its title implies. It is a panorama

not only of human life and human love, and of the beauties of art and nature, but of the range and reach of a mind exceptionally aware and of a spirit of undiscouraged loving-kindness.

From his three volumes of verse—*Sappho in Levkas*, *In April Once* and *Enzio's Kingdom*—William Alexander Percy, American and Southerner, has lately made his own selections, and has added a group of new poems. He is best known by the three title-poems mentioned above. The first is Sappho's burning odic invocation to Zeus; the second is a one-act play in blank verse of not a little charm and power; the third is a dramatic monologue in which Enzio, the favourite son of Frederick II, who had followed his father's policies loyally and who is now a hostage held in captivity by the Bolognese, hears of his father's death, and reviews and reveals before Berard the messenger the meanings of the speaker's chequered history.

With both of the thirteenth century themes dealt with in these latter works Mr. Percy shows himself imaginatively familiar, and dramatically skilful in unfolding his purposes as poet. (The present reviewer has considered these poems at some length in Volumes XXX and XXXIII of the *Sewanee Review*.) His language is usually rich and often eloquent; his subjects are chiefly romantic; his craftsmanship is sincere and progressively controlled; his sympathies are delicate; and his work is penetrated by the melancholy that comes when the artist reacts to his sense of the incompleteness of all human experience, the imperfection of all human achievement. Among the best of the lyrics, monologues and narratives are the widely known *Page's Road Song* and also *To Lucrezia*, *March Magic*, *St. Francis to the Birds*, *Autumn Wisdom*, *October*, *A Canticle*, *Beth Marie*, *Overtones*, *The Immortal Residue*, *A Volunteer's Grave*, *An Epistle from Corinth*, *Promethean*, *A Little Hymn*, *For Rip Who Died Mad*, *Threnody*, and *A*

Legend of Lacedæmon. The last two mentioned possess—though in differing kind—a rare loveliness. From the legend may be quoted some passages that should win readers for the whole:

Like lake-water where a sword thrusts and withdraws.
The silence healed,

A great peace came, the stillness grew all peace;
The wings of the oak-trees drooped and curved themselves
Over the bowed young god.

Prefacing the volume is a short, competent introduction by Mr. Llewellyn Jones. We agree with the contrast he establishes between Mr. Percy and the New York group by whom “too much is said too loudly.”

G. H. C.

The Letters of the Empress Frederick. Edited by the Right Honourable Sir Frederick Ponsonby, G.C.B., G.C.V.O.
London: Macmillan and Company, 1929.

Cassandra, daughter of Priam of Troy, so the old story runs, prophesied the ruin of her country but none believed her till too late. The Empress Frederick, daughter of Queen Victoria, wife of the liberally-minded Frederick III and mother of the ex-Kaiser William II, from 1888 to her death in 1901, beheld with increasing dismay the mad policies of her son which were destined to involve the Second German Empire in the cataclysm of 1918. Her son not only did not seek her counsel but lost no opportunity of showing how little regard he had for her or her opinions. All the Empress Frederick could do was to pour out her heart in long letters to her devoted mother Queen Victoria.

These letters to her mother were returned to the Empress Frederick who apparently contemplated writing a life of her husband or even of preparing her own letters for publication. When on her death-bed the Empress in March, 1901, confided

these letters to Sir Frederick Ponsonby, son of her life-long friend, Lady Mary Ponsonby. Sir Frederick took them to England and for twenty-seven years carefully guarded them at her house near Windsor. Then, fired by the criticism levelled at the Empress Frederick by that well-known apostle of the "new biography", Dr. Emil Ludwig, in his life of Kaiser William II, Sir Frederick decided to publish selections from the letters. He has in fact written a most readable biography of the Empress made up, as far as possible, from passages of her letters.

These letters show the Empress Frederick to have been an affectionate, strong-minded woman. She adored her husband, was devoted to her mother and cherished her father's memory. She loved her children and lamented the early deaths of two of her sons. Her grief on each occasion was tragic. Poor little Prince Sigismund, her third son, died at the age of twenty-one months in 1866, and Prince Waldemar, her fourth son, in 1879, aged ten. She had hoped that Waldemar would be a real grandson of the Prince Consort. Her eldest son, Prince William, afterwards Kaiser William II, although affectionate enough in his youth, became estranged from his parents in his early manhood and joined the party of Bismarck and his grandfather, Emperor William I. The Empress Augusta was never well-disposed to her daughter-in-law and Emperor William I allowed his son Frederick no part in the government either of Prussia or Germany.

Born at Buckingham Palace, November 1, 1840, as Princess Royal of England, and married on January 25, 1858, to Prince Frederick of Prussia, who became Crown Prince in 1861, the future Empress Frederick accepted her adopted country with devotion. But she never forgot that she was English. Her affection for her mother and her motherland was constant and unfailing. Her son, the ex-Kaiser, claims in his memoirs that his mother was "always most German in

England and most English in Germany." "And that," Ponsonby states, "was the main cause of her unpopularity."

For she was unpopular. To a great extent it was because of the enmity of Prince Bismarck and the Conservatives, but the Empress was often overbearing and tactless. Her husband was a sincere Liberal who sought to give Germany a constitutional monarchy modelled as far as possible after the British constitution. In this, as in all else, he possessed the steady support of his Princess. Bismarck used to sneer at "petticoat government" but a perusal of the letters does not show that, either as Crown Prince or Emperor, Frederick was dominated by his wife. But the unforgivable crimes of the Crown Princess were first that she was English and secondly that she took part in politics. At that time German women, and especially princesses, were supposed to devote themselves to church, children and kitchen and to nothing else. For a woman of royal blood to be interested in politics and especially to be a Liberal was unheard of. What made matters worse was the utter frankness with which the Crown Princess discussed the political situation. She never learned tact.

The political duel between the Crown Prince and Bismarck is portrayed in the letters. As a Liberal Prince Frederick protested against the "Blood and Iron" policy of Bismarck and quarrelled with his father as a result. In the three wars by which Bismarck brought about the unification of Germany the Crown Prince served with distinction. He was, in fact, one of the leading generals in the Franco-Prussian War and he even had a part in the formation of the Second German Empire. But Bismarck hated him and from 1871 till his father's death in 1888 Prince Frederick was never in the confidence of the government. The Iron Chancellor was in the saddle.

The tragedy of it all was that when the Emperor William died his son was also stricken by an incurable disease.

The details of the terrible year 1887-1888 are fully set forth in the letters. One may find there the sordid story of political intrigue, of professional hostility and of personal spite which hastened the death of the Emperor Frederick and completely broke his wife's heart. Suffice it to say that Sir Frederick Ponsonby frees the Empress of the oft-repeated charge that she summoned English specialists and would not listen to the advice of the German physicians and surgeons by proving that the first suggestion that Sir Morell MacKenzie be summoned came from the German doctors with the full approval of Bismarck. The ninety-eight days' reign of Frederic III was tragic in the extreme. The "wise Kaiser" as the Germans later termed him never had a chance. Bismarck remained Chancellor and German Liberalism was doomed. During these awful days the Empress watched over her husband and paid attention to affairs of state. Her agony was increased by the ever-widening breach with her son Prince William.

On June 15, 1888, all was over and William II was on the throne. The new Kaiser at once reverted to the policies of his grandfather and Bismarck was more deeply entrenched than ever. Utterly ignored by her son who had small reverence for his father's memory and driven from her palace, whose very name *Friedrichs Kron* (Frederick's Crown) was changed by William II's order, the Empress Frederick passed into political obscurity. It was then that she began to play her rôle of royal Cassandra. She was sufficiently acute to see how Bismarck was training William II in methods of absolute government and how the young Kaiser's head was being completely turned by the flatterers around him.

Persecution did not end with her husband's death. It then entered upon its most acute phase. The German doctors published long reports regarding the Emperor Frederick's illness. Sir Morell MacKenzie replied in an ill-advised book entitled *The Fatal Illness of Frederick the Noble*, charging the Ger-

man doctors with incompetence and with hastening their patient's death by their maltreatment. The Empress, who, of course, took no part in the controversy, again became the storm centre. Hardly had this died down when some fragments from the *War Diary of the Emperor Frederick* were published. These fragments were frankly critical of Bismarck. Again the Empress was blamed, though she had handed over the diary and other documents after her husband's death at the orders of the new Kaiser. Bismarck's fall in 1890 removed her old enemy from office, but did not improve the relations between the Empress Frederick and Kaiser William II.

Her distress at the headstrong policies of her son was intense. Time after time she wrote to Queen Victoria showing in the plainest way that she saw that William was travelling the road to ruin. One quotation will suffice: "William neither understands or values advice, he neither asks nor takes it, and, as he is very green for his age, constant blunders and *bévues* are the result. 'I suffer no one near me. Everyone who is against me I will crush'."

Cassandra had spoken. Unlike her classical prototype the Empress did not live to see the ruin of Germany. When she died in 1901 William was launched on his ship-building campaign which was to snatch the trident out of Britannia's hands. All this was wormwood and gall to an English princess.

WALTER N. SAGE.

Humanism and America. Essays on the Outlook of Modern Civilization. Edited by Norman Foerster, New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1930. pp. 294. \$3.50.

Contributors: Louis Trenchard More, Irving Babbitt, Paul Elmer More, G. R. Elliott, T. S. Eliot, Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., Alan Reynolds Thompson, Robert Schafer,

Harry Haydon Clark, Stanley P. Chase, Gorham B. Munson, Bernard Bandler II, Sherlock Bronson Gass, Richard Lindley Brown.

The fourteen authors who contribute to this symposium, represent, with their editor, the more conservative and dogmatic wing of the faith humanistic. The prophet is Arnold; Rousseau—at least according to Professor Babbitt—is the false prophet. Let the priests who serve the false gods beware lest they be slain upon their altars; for the modern world is an unpruned orchard grown rank in its own freedom and much blame therefor rests upon the 'naturalist' and the 'humanitarian.'

Nine of the essays, with the preface, indicate the need for 'humanism', together with its aims and methods as the authors conceive them; and five might be defined as examples of the humanistic spirit exercising its critical function upon American literature. A good bibliography is appended to assist the inquiring reader.

Order, balance, discipline, decorum, humility: such might well be the watchwords of those writers who, following more or less closely the leadership of Irving Babbitt and Paul Elmer More, deal with the essence of humanism. Their movement, however, like Zionism, looks forward as well as backward and is the life-pattern of such as "in every age aim at proportionateness through a cultivation of the law of measure." Babbitt's emphasis upon this perpetual need of the moderating spirit and his fear of 'the will to power' is supported by More's more mystical outlook, his sense of duality, and his conviction that the soul is not subject to material laws. Characteristically More deplores the unprophetic art of his time. "Always the great creators have taken the substance of life, and, not by denying it or attempting to evade its laws but by looking more intently below its surface, have found meanings and values

that transmute it into something at once the same and different."

In *The Pride of Modernity*, a thoughtful study by G. R. Elliott, dualism is identified very definitely with the humanistic outlook and 'the pride of spiritual *monism*' is indicated as the greatest danger to modern thought. T. S. Eliot has something to say about religion's need of humanism, particularly as a mediator in the relations of religion with science. Discussing *The Pretensions of Science* Louis Trenchard More (Professor of Physics in the University of Cincinnati) stresses the point that "the history of physics, since the time of Maxwell, shows a record of vain efforts to reconstruct a materialistic monism." Frank Jewett Mather, Jr., writes with reasoned pessimism concerning *The Plight of our Arts*. Bernard Bandler II contributes an interesting comparison of psychology and ethics. Richard Lindley Brown's *Courage and Education* is a brief, and at times ironic, comment upon the study of English in an American university. Sherlock Bronson Gass reminds us that community of minds has ever been essential to intellectual vitality. "It was not an accident that friendship played so profound a part in Greek life, not an accident that thought and letters so flourished."

The five essayists who deal with the creative and critical literature of America find much at fault. The reason is not far to seek. Humanism, in the Arnoldian tradition, is heliotropic and seeks the light. Naturalism, to the humanist, lacks this saving grace; for the 'naturalist' 'looks his last on all things lovely' without apparent regret; turning aside to the most sordid aspects of life and, by over-emphasis, changing their factual reality into artistic unreality. In Robert Schafer's words, naturalism "lights up the animal in man but tells man nothing of that which positively distinguishes him from the beast—more, it vindictively denies that anything save hypocrisy and delusion does so distinguish him."

There are many interesting details in these five essays, such as Alan R. Thompson's treatment of Eugene O'Neill, or the fiction which Harry H. Clark discovers in Pandora's Box. Yet one is surprised to find little recognition of the living protest against naturalism which is appearing in contemporary novels.

What of this new 'humanism'? Can it be at once conservative and revolutionary, as was the older humanism of the fifteenth century? Popular preachers will attempt to annex it; and the Pythagoreans will always jeer at those who 'think nobly of the soul.' Yet its champions believe with Edmund Burke that 'men of intemperate minds cannot be free'; and they look favourably on a humility which accepts restraints and leadership—through no blind submission to authority, but with open-eyed recognition that some things may be taught and learned.

Humanism should not be a creed. It presumes knowledge, but has to do with wisdom; which is a discipline in handling the fruit of knowledge. *Humanism and America* represents the considered thought of three or four men who are expressing once more their conviction that all is not well with the world — particularly the New World — and the arts which represent it. Their opinions are supported by a number of young critics and professors who advance their ideas, each after his own fashion.

It is not the purpose of this review to assay the plus and minus values of the movement; which, if it succeeds, will do so not merely through poise or decorum, or by some coup of criticism; but by infusing into the sincere and imaginative minds of our creative artists a conception of man and his destiny nobler than those which have recently prevailed.

In pursuing this ideal, as several of its leaders have perceived, humanism moves parallel with religion—with that religion which seeks a *via media*. For religion, no less than

humanism, should seek 'the strait and narrow way' between the fond dreams of the uplifters and reformers who would restore our natural goodness by legislating us into perfection or converting us *en masse*, and the black nightmares of those exploiters of our brutishness who brood upon the quagmires of despair.

Such a path has never been easy; yet its difficult ascent brings the compensations of a wider horizon, clearer air, more select company, and the severe approval of such as have lived greatly toward high ends.

ROBERT CUMBERLAND.

QUEEN'S QUARTERLY

AUTUMN, 1930

GEORGE GISSING

BY MORLEY ROBERTS

WE know that writers can live as personalities long after they have ceased to be read. The stories of their lives may be better than anything they did and the very failure of their dearest ambitions may bring them the relative immortality for which they hoped. Personality and deep human experience draw even those alien in thought to their tombs. We read books about Byron and Shelley though *Epipsychidion* and *Childe Harold* are never opened. This will, very possibly, be the case with George Gissing. Interest in his experience and his character may well outlast any in his work, though in some happier future social historians may exhume him and compare parts at least of his bitterer books with the gloomy pictures of Hogarth. And yet he is still read far more than might have seemed possible when the critics tried to estimate him after he died. Five of his best books were reprinted lately in England. I myself wrote prefaces for them which

perhaps placed him with some fairness. These books were also printed in the United States, not with the expectation of any abnormal sale, but in the reasonable belief that some thousands there and in Canada would be interested in one who has been called the last of the Victorians and was certainly also the first of the desperately serious moderns. If, however, it is true that the man himself continually excites sympathy and curiosity, it may be interesting to some if, to what I have already written of him, I venture to add a few more casual notes on his life and work.

It is a melancholy but interesting task to look back and to turn over a portfolio of papers about him, a cover which holds a collection still unpublished of his letters, and to read again articles I and others wrote when he was alive and after his death. For those I wrote while he lived were printed with his permission, and after some discussion with him as to what I proposed to say. They were, however, not submitted to him, and he never saw them till publication. That he was always pleased, or much pleased, cannot be said, for to adopt the attitude of an entirely detached critic so far as I found it possible, made the tone of the articles rather cool and deliberate than warm and enthusiastic. As I was known to be closely acquainted with him, he was anxious for me not to be suspected of an over-friendly estimate of his power.

The first time I had any opportunity of writing about him was due to my friend Henry Hyde Champion, the ex-gunner who became a Socialist, was tried along with Burns and Hyndman for sedition and conspiracy after the Trafalgar Square riots in 1887, and died some years ago in Australia. To his somewhat occult and subterranean pursuit of politics Champion, who had to earn a somewhat precarious living while advocating a better life for others, then added the task of editing an ephemeral paper called the *Novel Review*. He

suggested that the author of *Demos* would make an interesting subject. It seemed necessary to me to ask Gissing's permission, which he gave readily, though I asked for it diffidently enough because it is always a very difficult problem to write of any living author and even more difficult to write of an intimate friend. And I knew that I should rather fail by a studied lack of enthusiasm than by any excess of it, being so afraid in those days of an accusation of partisanship and log-rolling. It was possible that Gissing might think he had been damned by faint praise rather than helped at a time he much needed it. I was not and never have been in the abundant sense a Gissing enthusiast. His best work is far too painful to be enthusiastic about, and as there will be occasion to remark in a later note, his lack of humour was sometimes humorous to me. Owing to what I once said to him the world now lacks the most precious example of this failure. If Gissing is reckoned to have been a main link between Victorian literature and later developments, it was natural for him to use the episode, now utterly discarded, which in its turn can be looked on as the descendant of the interpolated story, the last examples of which are to be found in *Pickwick*. Gissing conceived that the episode could be used to lighten the gloomy course of the main story he was then writing, and on this occasion used it to deadly effect in sixty pages of the heaviest humour I ever read, humour that degenerated into mere horse-play at that. After much argument and entreaty he agreed to cut it out and so far as I remember never attempted to use a long episode again. But very naturally, since he had humour in his talk, he continued to believe that he must have it in his writing, and some of his characters he affirmed positively were humorous characters, when the dimmest notion that they were to be regarded as such would never cross the ordinary reader's mind. If they were sometimes ironically conceived the irony might

be detected by the expert, but, as Gissing knew that the English people distrusted irony and experienced when reading it an uneasy sensation that they were themselves being laughed at, he could hardly count on them taking it for humour. Yet he was always keenly anxious to have his humours recognized as humour. Once, when I was asked to write a short paper about him and told him so, he urged me in a very curious long letter to defend him from the critics who said he had none. This letter, as may easily be guessed, was an absolute proof that as a writer he lacked it. It is hard to imagine a real humorist trying to prove that he is one. Of course I did my best to let him down lightly, though my article assuredly was not very satisfying to him.

After all, when it is recognized that Gissing's sources of inspiration sprang rather from Russian work than from any other, and that his early books were written in conditions of poverty, misery and almost entire isolation, we might as well ask Dostoievski and his congeners for the humour of Rabelais as to ask it of George Gissing. He was distinctly conscious of his brotherhood with the unhappy and depressed *intelligentsia* of Russia. His admiration for their work sprang from sympathy. He felt that the circumstances of life in an economic civilization like our own might easily parallel those of a political despotism which considered Siberia the safest place for any dissatisfied author. I wrote once, 'So much is certain, Tourgeneff moved what Zola had really failed to stir. For he was never a Zolaist even at his worst.' It is true that Gissing had an insatiable appetite for Balzac and once he had in his mind the enormous ambition (in him curiously absurd) to rival the *Comédie Humaine* of that gigantic and architectonic genius. For he obviously lacked construction. He could not, even under the evil influence of James Payn, write a story 'with a plot'. Payn, who, when

Demos was published, read for Smith, Elder, the publishers of this novel, was one of those recalcitrant Old Men of Fiction who then asserted savagely that the one purpose of fiction was to tell stories which were amusing and entertaining. To construct anything like an indictment of social conditions was really a literary crime. If Gissing could have merely told tales he would have had Payn in his pocket and his own hand in the pockets of the firm to some reasonable extent.

It is hard for us nowadays, especially for the young, to recognize the shackles in which authors of fifty years ago were supposed to dance. Gissing groaned to me that any illicit sex association had to be covered up at the very least by making it a bigamy. The empty ceremony of a bigamy covered much sin with publishers' readers and the virtuous public. One example of the marvellous power of ceremonial occurred a few years ago in England. A married man actually went through the ceremony of marriage with his wife's sister, while the wife was living in the same house on good terms with both of them. And, incredible as it may seem, the wife came to the wedding in all friendliness! Without that empty ceremony her sister refused to live with her brother-in-law, who, however, promptly went to prison. This story might have appealed to Gissing. Probably the bigamy would have satisfied Payn and the proprieties. We have more liberty now and probably too much. I have lately looked at some books by women writers who are clearly proud of their capacity for the effective, if passing, capture of many lovers. Payn would, perhaps, have died of apoplexy if he had been asked to print any of these. There are no three stars needed in any modern novel, and the discreet line-space in which seduction took place some years ago is now enlarged to take in a medico-pornographic moving picture of the physiology of passion. This would have appealed to Gissing as little as it appeals to me. The writer who cannot

'get across' all he wants to say without being offensive to common decency is either not a writer or is merely one who panders to a morbid section of the public.

It was not, however, merely the difficulties of handling the necessarily recurrent sex question which hampered Gissing. His themes were so often unhappy. To choose an unhappy theme was obviously not a popular thing. In those later Victorian times the average book-reader, or rather novel-reader, was living in a world which seemed to have reached at last a comparative stage of static satisfaction. The English world was largely a world of Podsnap and Podsnappery. The old threat of Chartism had evaporated. 'Reform' had accomplished everything necessary. Socialism was nothing more than the peculiar ideas of a few cranks. Labour was, or clearly ought to be, thoroughly satisfied with its conditions. Everything was for the best in the best of all possible worlds. What, then, did any writer mean by concocting books in which people were not only miserable to begin with, but actually remained miserable to the end? Surely it was possible to show what a really fine world it was by at least bringing the hero and heroine out of their troubles in a happy conclusion due to the way in which they handled the circumstances in which they found themselves. In those days it was a generally accepted belief that most misery was really due to the wrongful propensities of those who were miserable. If they were miserable they must be vicious. Yes, even though such a writer as Walter Savage Landor had asked whether it was not time to replace the lie that vice necessarily leads to misery by the truth that misery leads to vice. To a man like James Payn it might have seemed that Gissing's misery led to the vice, to the very crime, of making a tragedy a tragedy to the end. It has often been a matter of wonder to me that Payn ever accepted a book of Gissing's. Had it not been for the accident of *Demos* coming

into his hands just after the Trafalgar Square riots we may feel sure he would never have printed one. He made up for doing so, however, by forcing Gissing to smash the whole tragic conception of *A Life's Morning* by substituting a happy end, which the wretched writer manufactured as he groaned and tore his hair. One of Gissing's favourite books was Murger's *Vie de Bohème*, but he never achieved the sublime detachment of the poor artists there depicted who changed anything to please a dealer and did it more or less cheerfully. I suppose we still have our James Payns, though it might seem nowadays that they turn down books, not for the lack of a story, but for the lack, it may be, of exciting impropriety. I believe that some writers, of an incurable reticence about their own sex affairs, however popularly entrancing these might be if handled in the right modern manner, have actually gone out of business and are now living in decent poverty. "It's a mad world, my masters!"

When I look over my Gissing notes, a mass destined for the future writer who will some day do a complete biography of him, I find numerous estimates of his work by many hands. On the whole, I think that the contemporary estimates made of him by the few capable of judging what he did are fairly adequate. Frankly, I may say that many are better than any short article which I wrote myself. They were not hampered by personal knowledge of him. For if one knows or knew a writer very well and is yet devoid of an unreasoning, or almost unreasoning, admiration for him, it is very hard to write except with restraint. And, as I said earlier, from the very first I never had an extreme admiration for Gissing's work. If I had not known him it is highly probable that I should never have been able to read him. It was not the sort of stuff likely to appeal to a world-wanderer. This should be as easy to understand as it is to imagine that he looked upon me as a

sort of 'wild man of the woods'. Certainly I came not merely from the open road, but from the trackless plains of Australia, the prairies of Texas, and the mountains of British Columbia. He set to work to polish me up, to re-educate me into being his companion. He woke up Greek and Latin in me and watered any literary growth almost with tears. But all the same, even when I read a Greek tragedy with him, he felt, almost with alarm, that half of his pupil was away on horseback, or perhaps in a fo'c's'le. I believe it gave him an uneasy feeling that his own outlook was terribly small and cramped, or at the least that I might think so. And indeed I did, for it took me years to believe even doubtfully that the world a man like Gissing lived in, which extended through all classic history and geography, might be big enough in all conscience. But we are apt to overrate the value of what we ourselves know and can do, and it often irritated me to see him making close studies of an infernal slum and some slop-built little bourgeois when his own admirable and really athletic constitution might have sent him on some such wander years as my own. These I naturally enough thought the only university worth going to. Hence in a way there was always a subdued conflict going on between us, though I am sure he never looked on my peregrinations as I looked on his experiences and explorations of Islington or Camberwell. This latent conflict came out later in other ways, when we reached a deadlock over metaphysical and other speculations, in which I took refuge, perhaps for want of the wild to play in, and we had to agree at last that such subjects should be seldom alluded to. Speculation disturbed him greatly and threatened like a great wind to overthrow the hut he had built to shelter him from such storms. For though he wrote, say, of Camberwell, in his hut he had the Colosseum and even all Italy and Greece, with the philosophers of the latter barred out.

As I have said, I have no overwhelming admiration for his more characteristic work, if we take the studies of the slums and lower classes as such. I believe this was due to the fact that in their essence I knew them far better than he did. It is very easy for a highly cultivated man to reckon the uncultivated unhappy: even to reckon their laughter the result of alcohol or ironic disgust with life. Of course I do not deny there *is* misery. I have seen enough of that all over the world. But the way human beings stand up to it is marvellous. Those who really kick against the pricks are those who have escaped the worst and are violently ambitious of getting still farther from it. Gissing never really believed that the lower classes had just as much humour as the other classes, and perhaps more. Misery cultivates humour. It is the one thing that lightens it. Who that ever went through the hell of sea-passages in the seventies did so without real laughter? Or exploration? Or the trenches? We may reckon that British humour 'won the war'. Humour wins the war all the time, but Gissing never saw how universal it is. There should be good jesters in the hell of the orthodox in spite of Dante, who, we may be sure, never made a joke in his life.

I spoke just now of what the more or less capable critics said of Gissing after his death. On the whole the best estimate of him was that of Thomas Seccombe in his *Introductory Survey*, preluding Gissing's *House of Cobwebs*, a selection of stories or rather of sketches. Another of the best was done by Israel Zangwill, who was very capable and fair. He had, as we all know, a great sense of humour, even if, when I met him in Northumberland Avenue during the most dangerous time of the war, April, 1917, he replied to my remark that things were going very badly by saying, "Yes, indeed! I simply *cannot* get my new book published," which reminded me of another case in which a young man refused to volunteer

as he was engaged in writing "an important book on metaphysics." Zangwill had a high but variable opinion of Gissing. He strongly objected to those who said that the man's work was photographic. This adjective was applied to *The Odd Women*. "Now the book is painfully sordid and when was a photograph that?" He thought Gissing head and shoulders above many of those whose heads and shoulders are continually figuring in the illustrated papers. But Zangwill, not so much the Englishman as a Continental, hit the nail on the head when he complained that Gissing could not keep his own personality out of his books. This is a point in which the French are still miles ahead of most English writers. What Frenchman or European could have possibly written as Gissing did once when he imagined some disagreeing with him—"For them I do not write"? This is the more curious, as Gissing was steeped in French and Russian fiction. Zangwill was quite right when he complained of him writing of his characters not as they appeared to themselves but as they appeared to him. That is why he so often exaggerated misery. What is misery to A may be almost jollity with B. Life without books was life with misery to Gissing. He could scarcely imagine a bourgeois family of Balham, with one Bible and an old Bradshaw, as not in the depths of unhappy degradation. In 1903, the year of Gissing's death, Zangwill wrote another appreciation of him. I shall not dilate on this but may remark that I certainly agreed with him about *The Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft*, which never appealed to me any more than the book did to his Jewish critic. Here we may surely disagree with Seccombe. Not merely had it been done before by many, but all its weak revolt could be found in his other books *passim*. And personally I could not bear, and even now cannot bear, its atmosphere of feeble resignation. Thoreau said that resignation was no more than confirmed desperation, but

though in his life Gissing was often desperate enough and desperate with good reason, this book wholly lacks the last final possibility of putting up a fight which is found in the desperate. The writer had given in, or so it seemed. I possess the first copy of this book that Gissing gave away. He gave it me just when I was leaving St. Jean de Luz and I read it in the train going to Bordeaux. There is one slight reference to me in it, when he speaks of having, at one time, only one friend. The book depressed and still depresses me. It represents very unfairly, I think, the few hours in which he lost all courage. These hours are never really good to remember or really useful to write about. It is not worthy of the author of such powerful work as *The Nether World*, which lacks little of being a world's masterpiece. That little! What is it? Quite obviously the resolute compression that the horrible old three-volume system practically forbade, and also that objectivity in the sense of high artistic detachment and suppression of the writer's personality which Gissing never completely achieved. But, after all, he felt that the novel was forced on him by modern conditions and his own life. It was the only way he had to express himself in the tortures of a diseased civilization. It could be made art, but was no natural form of art. His views of pure literary art took in "the idylls of Theocritus, of Moschus; the simpler tragedy; the natural woes and joys of him who ploughs the soil or works at the wine-press," but I still believe that in his heart he loathed the novel itself, even as he loathed what he often drew so well. Art is never a savage personal indictment.

What real influence has Gissing had? Has he had any? It is a hard question. Perhaps in one direction. So had R. L. Stevenson. These two writers, more than poles asunder since it seems that whole worlds divide them, assuredly tried to raise the general standard of ordinary English prose. For

a time they succeeded, and perhaps their influence will not be wholly lost when the strange incult obscurities of some modern experimental novelists have gone into the waste-paper basket. What Gissing or Stevenson or any greater master of English than either would have thought of James Joyce, the moment's godling worshipped by an etiolated semi-psychopathic crowd of decerebrate admirers, can easily be imagined by any critic who retains sobriety. And it is not hard to say how such a real critic as Gissing would have reckoned up the claims of women writers whose chief claim to a passing notoriety is that no one can understand them. But doubtless the present tendency to anarchy in the English language is no more than a symptom of general restlessness and the remarkable mental disorders which are apt to emerge in unstable intellects during periods of social revolution. These may be distinctly related to definite pathological conditions. Among the insane we may find a symptomatic graphorrhœa sometimes characterized by ideational inertia, or domination by one idea. It is pleasing to imagine the almost ludicrous air of indignation with which Gissing would inspect some modern masterpieces of shoddy construction, laboured obscurity, and meaning not worth the trouble of discovery. Like all sound writers Gissing believed that the aphorism that language was given us to conceal our thoughts might be left to diplomatists. He always aimed at clarity, and rarely if ever missed it.

Yet, all the same, as said above, he was no born writer of fiction. His passion for literature was the passion for enjoying it. He did not want to criticize: he loved to point out the undiscovered glories of what had been done, rather than to discover new ways. That was one thing which helped him to be a good companion. Bring something to his notice which he had missed and hear him 'chortle'. I made him a Walt Whitman enthusiast. Whenever I went to see him he had some-

thing in store for me. How great his disappointment if I failed to agree! It was this eager enthusiasm which would have been invaluable if life had been kind and had made him, say, a Professor of Literature at a great university. Sometimes I think, and assuredly never without melancholy, what a delightful personality would have emerged. Such success would have brought more success, and he would have budded and burgeoned wonderfully in a general atmosphere of kindly approval, which could not have been denied to such a teacher. This kind of life would have nourished his incomplete sense of humour, which was for ever inhibited by his conditions and by a perpetual sense of indignation. He lived too much with himself, and all humorists have lived much with their fellows. We cannot imagine Rabelais a recluse. To live much alone in enforced poverty and the very shadow of despair and desperation might inspire a Hogarth but it would destroy a Dickens. To see Gissing as he might always have been one had to judge by happy moments — moments when the sun shone, when happy chance had led him to some new vein of literary ore, when there was food for him, actual feasting if it so happened, the wine of man and the wine of the gods. How often he found enforced labour at the desk a Barmecidal feast!

Gissing — perhaps because of much starvation — loved good food and wine and by the malignity of fate rarely tasted either. He was capable of thinking Chianti a wine to chuckle over. He loved wine in ancient-shaped flasks and would have worshipped it in an amphora. He would have loved to lodge with Lucullus: he read Brillat-Savarin with gusto. And yet as he cooked common tasty messes in his own pot he could chuckle with anticipation and for the time envy none. His remembrances of Italy included not only the Colosseum, but the cookery in a certain *ristorante* of Naples. He refers to such things in his letters to me. Food was worthy of more

than a mere mention. His feeling about the average lower class cook, or 'food-spoiler', as the old sailormen called those they had to depend upon, were of the bitterest. Is it very strange that I am unable to see much of him in the books and papers written about him? The authors rarely, if ever, saw him eating and drinking. What a grief it is to me not to be able now to point out to him the remarkable coincidence between Pontonous in the *Odyssey* and Mrs. Gamp. For Homer says—*πὰρ δὲ δέπας οἴγιοιο, πιεῖν, ὅτε θυμὸς ἀνώγει*—'A cup of wine at hand, to drink when inclination prompts,' so that Ulysses could "put it to his lips when so disposed." The translation is free but the meaning identical.

I have spoken of his letters. Some years ago I was asked to allow those I possess to be printed privately. This, it seemed to me then, as it is even now, impossible to permit. I have still fifty-two letters, but by some carelessness of others many of the earlier and more interesting ones were lost. I have now none dated according to Comte's *Positivist Calendar*. This curious aberration of Gissing's to some sort of creed, however vague, was really alien from his whole nature and was due to the reaction in him when he experienced kindness at the helpful hands of Frederic Harrison. Later in life he ignored that short period of semi-belief in the bright future of a positivist humanity, and never referred to it in any way. It seemed to him almost like the strange conversion of a suffering foreign friend to a semi-insane passing Christianity, also a reaction to help in distress. He rejected creeds of all sorts. He wrote to me in 1902 apropos of something I said of Ryecroft—

"I am a little oppressed by the burden of the mystery" [*i.e.*, of this inexplicable world], "not seldom I think with deep content of the time when speculation will be at an end. But my delight in the beauty of the visible world, and my enjoyment of the great things of literature, grow stronger.

My one desire now is to *utter* this passion, yet the result of one's attempts is rather a poor culmination for life."

Hudson also refused speculation, not as Gissing did from fear of mental disturbance, but from a serene disregard of any speculation not concerned with his splendid objective world. For when speaking of Halstead, the author of *Idlehurst*, Hudson said in a letter to me: "Like Gissing he is incapable of understanding or believing in a mind that can do with nature pure and simple and find it sufficient for happiness."

Perhaps these men only really touched on points of literature. I think Hudson's view of Gissing was one of pity that any should be so concerned with the more miserable aspects of life, though he owned the power with which Gissing could write. Of Hudson's *El Ombú* Gissing wrote to me: "Very wonderful, dear old Hudson's *El Ombú*. Talk about atmosphere!" And again—"Of course you read *Hampshire Days*. Hudson will be a classic in the fullness of time." Often I wish these two men had written something of each other, or that I had kept careful notes of their *obiter dicta*. Unluckily one remembers so little when full men talk, and they were both most excellent talkers, though Gissing's world was narrow and he would willingly have made it narrower, just a room full of the classics of all tongues, with a view of a sunny cloister or quadrangle. Strange at this moment to think that Gissing was never on horseback, never played a game of 'Rugger', never stood in danger of his life from any form of violence! What a little of the real wide world familiar to Hudson and myself would have done for him is 'a puzzling question, but not beyond conjecture,' for he had an admirable physique, that of a natural but untrained athlete. But then there was so much in him that never flowered and scarcely pushed up a bud. Therefore he never lived to the full as Hudson did for years

of his life at least, and as I have tried to do in spite of more ill health than Gissing ever had till the last year or two. My own peregrinations Gissing used to look on as a form of madness almost unaccountable in a man capable, if not of great literature, at least of something worth while and of some power of critical appreciation. Well, I own to feeling that anyone who would write in a cellar with the whole world open to him was as mad as any vagrant, hobo, or beach-comber among my world acquaintances—or even madder. It is a pleasant speculation to imagine Gissing as a man inured to hard physical work with, say, the axe, the pick and shovel, a course really more open to him than it ever was to Hudson, for to Hudson's early cardiac incapacity he added a most curious inability to use his hands, except in the horseman's sense. Gissing as a hard and bronzed and healthy man would never have given us *Ryecroft*, which would have been a good thing for him. We get much literature which we value that cost the writer the whole wide world.

It was my intention to write something of things that happened immediately after Gissing's death, when a vain and foolish effort was made by some to induce the world to believe that at the very last he was weakly false to his deeply ingrained agnosticism, and that he died in the portals of a church with which he had not the remotest sympathy. But I have left myself no space to write of this and to quote certain letters, my own as well as those of others who took advantage of his final agony and the silence of death to announce with solemn pomp that he had then accepted creeds which he regarded as the historical remains of a crude and primitive theology, incapable of inspiring credit in any reasoning being.

THE GREEK MYSTERIES

BY JOHN WATSON

TO a modern mind the term 'mystery' naturally suggests the idea of something difficult to understand or something even incomprehensible.¹ In order to gain a clear conception of what to the Greek mind the word implied, we must get rid of this misleading association. The word 'mystery' (*μυστήριον*) does not of itself suggest anything 'mysterious' or even difficult of comprehension, but merely something which must be imparted by some one already in possession of it, yet such as the ordinary man could at least suppose that he understood.

C. A. Lobeck, in his epoch-making work, entitled *Aglaophamus*, draws a broad distinction between civic Mysteries, such as the Eleusinian at Athens, which were "in the charge of public officials, and occasional functions performed on behalf of private persons for the purpose of appeasing the *Manes* or of averting evil." Speaking of the Eleusinian Mysteries, Aristotle assures us that no definite instruction was imparted in them, and we know that the culminating point of initiation was admission to a spectacle in which amid a blaze of light were probably exhibited, together with histories of certain gods, the horrors which await the wicked and the blessedness of the pious in the Elysian fields. These Mysteries were at Athens what we may fairly call civic. They were under the charge of the King-archon. Almost the whole population of Athens appears to have been initiated, for initiation, not birth,

¹Books consulted: Cheetham, *The Mysteries, Pagan and Christian*; Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*; Angus, *The Mystery Religions and Christianity*; Inge, *Christian Mysticism*.

was still the qualification for admission. In contrast to such civic Mysteries stand the observances peculiar to a voluntary group of men united by a common belief and a feeling of brotherhood. These Mysteries, says Lobeck, were "those sacred rites which took place, not at public altars, but either in the night, or within sanctuaries, or in remote and solitary places."²

We may distinguish four periods in the history of the Mysteries. In the first period the Mystery-Religions were very simple, and did not imply even a special initiation, since they were the religion of a whole pastoral or primitive agricultural people. In the process of historical evolution this first period was followed by a second, during which the primitive religion, with certain modifications, was the religion of the lower stratum of society, no doubt formed of the aboriginal population which had survived the successive waves of conquest. The third period witnesses the rise of private religious associations, and probably lasted from the first introduction of Orphic cults into the Greek world, which took place two or three centuries before Alexander the Great, until the reign of Caligula. The final period is that of the Empire. Augustus and Tiberius were not favourably disposed towards Oriental religions, but with Caligula, and more particularly from the accession of the Flavian emperors, these religions came into universal favour, and under the Syrian emperors were elevated into State-Religions. What were once local worships cultivated in private associations became universal religions, only that men were not born into them but entered by initiation or rebirth.

As the later Mysteries preserved much in ritual that offended the moral sense of the age, allegory was introduced

²Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, p. 270.

whereby those elements which were originally vulgar tokens of life and generation and birth were made to yield a spiritual meaning. In this way the Mysteries were able to suggest ideas that were in harmony with the stage of moral education reached by the age. Some of the Mysteries were almost entirely symbolic, while others provided a more elaborate liturgy and a fuller theology. These latter sought to heal the breach between man and God and to procure forgiveness of sin. Means of purification and formulas of access to the deity, as well as acclamations of confidence and victory, were part of the apparatus of every Mystery. The *mystes* believed that in some mysterious way he was brought by initiation into fellowship with the eternal life of the god. The Orphic Mysteries, as Plato tells us, promised escape from ills beyond death and foretold an awful future for the uninitiated (*Republic*, 305 A). "After the time of Alexander the Great," says Schwegler, "a feeling of unhappiness, of unappeasable longing, took the place of that fair unity between spirit and nature which had been characteristic of the better periods of Grecian political and intellectual life. A last desperate attempt to reach the alienated divine life . . . by means of transcendent speculation and ascetic mortification was made by Neo-Platonism; it failed, and ancient philosophy sank in complete exhaustion, ruined in the attempt to conquer dualism. Christianity took up the problem."³ As weariness overtook Hellenic thought, and scepticism as to the ability of Reason to attain to reality gained ground, the demand for authority and for the revelation of a 'sure word' increased.

Plato, Posidonius, and Philo prepared the way for the transition from Western to Eastern religious conceptions. While asserting that the Creator and Father of the world is

³Schwegler, *History of Philosophy*, Stirling's Transl., p. 143.

apprehensible by thought, Plato admits that this is an arduous task demanding special qualifications. It was Posidonius, however, who definitely maintained that the knowledge of God transcends conceptual thought. Philo, though he struggles to retain the Greek view of God as comprehensible by Reason, says that "the Creator made no soul in any body capable by its own power of seeing the Creator."

Subsequently, especially in the second and third centuries of our era, the intermixture of Greek thought and Oriental mystic speculation grew apace. As Norden, in his *Agnostos Theos*, says: "The Greek sought his *Weltanschauung* by way of speculation. With his unique clearness of conceptual thinking he knocked at the gate of knowledge; he aimed at intellectual apprehension by his logical faculties, the mystic-ecstatic element being at least in principle excluded. The Oriental acquires his knowledge of God not by way of speculation, but in the emotional life slumbering in the depths of his soul; and awakened through religious needs, it brings him to a union with God. Such a union issues in a complete ascent to God, so that knowledge is acquired in a supernatural fashion to the exclusion of the intellect, because God of His grace manifests Himself to the soul that strives after Him. Hence faith and enlightened vision supersede scientific knowledge and understanding, a profound inner experience supersedes reflection, pious surrender to the Absolute takes the place of that proud sense of enquiry which prescribes its own bounds. Only through union with God is a knowledge of the world and man made possible; consequently this knowledge of the world and man is rated as of merely secondary importance."^{3a}

Marked differences obtained among the Mysteries. The Mystery proper consisted in the mystic experiences, but for many it meant no more than the liturgical representations.

^{3a} Page 113.

These varied according to the spiritual maturity of the particular Mystery; but, speaking generally, we may say that the Mysteries appealed not to the intellect, but through eye, ear, and imagination, to the emotions. What Farnell has said of the Eleusinian Mysteries applies in a measure to all: "To understand the quality and intensity of the impression we should borrow something from the modern experiences of Christian Communion Service, Mass, and Passion Play, and bear in mind also the extraordinary susceptibility of the Greek mind to an artistically impressive pageant."⁴

A Mystery-Religion was thus a divine drama, which portrayed the story of the struggles, sufferings, and victory of a patron deity. The main object was to quicken the emotional life. With the exception of the Hermetic theology and Orphism, the Mysteries were never conspicuously doctrinal. No doubt instruction was imparted, but it occupied quite a secondary place. Such instruction was necessary to convince the participant that he had found a redemptive religion.

The Mysteries brought an evangel of life and immortality, and as the hereditary principle of membership known to the State-religions was superseded by that of personal volition, which was the dominating principle since the days of Alexander the Great, the Mysteries intensified individualism. As a personal religion, a Mystery-Religion takes on the character of a cosmic religion. The craving of man for order within as well as without is one of the most prominent notes in the Hellenistic age.

We may say generally that there are three main stages in a Mystery-Religion: Probation, Initiation, and Blessedness. Any one who desired to enter the fellowship of a religious brotherhood was called upon to undergo examination and disciplinary preparation. The preparatory purification was

⁴ Art. *Mystery*, Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed.

of a liberal character, adapted to candidates of every degree of spirituality. A vow of absolute secrecy as to what was said and done behind closed doors was imposed in the initiation proper. Then followed the proclamation of some awful deterrent formulae, which were accompanied, in some cases at least, by terrifying sights. It may be safely inferred that some sort of Confession of sin was required of the neophyte. And Baptisms, or lustral purifications according to carefully prescribed forms, were required. There were also Sacrifices, the number and character of which doubtless varied with each Mystery. Ascetic practices, some of them of great severity, were prescribed with a view to purification. Abstinence from food was common to all the Mysteries, and eager initiands often exceeded what was demanded as a supererogatory merit. Another feature in preparation for the full privileges of the Mysteries was the imposition of pilgrimages of a penitential nature. These were sometimes repeated after initiation as special tokens of devotion, and in the first century of our era they became increasingly common. Lastly, painful self-mortification was enjoined upon those celebrants who desired to reap the fullest advantages of adherence. It was held that man must enter into fellowship with the deity's sufferings if he would participate in the deity's joy.

We know less about the process of Initiation proper than about any other part of the mysteries, but it is improbable that any elaborate dogmatic teaching was imparted. The most impressive sacrament of the Mysteries was the *Taurobolium*, or bath in bull's blood—the nearest approach to the religion of the Cross made by paganism.

Since the revival of the sixth century B.C. the idea of Regeneration had become familiar. Every Mystery-Religion offered means of suppressing the old man and of imparting or vitalizing the spiritual principle. The serious *Mystes* believed

that the sacrament of Initiation made him a 'new creature', and that he passed in a real sense from death into life. Initiation proper was considered as a death from which believers arose through re-birth, and the more spiritual and mature a Mystery became, the more clamant grew the demand for regeneration.

Closely allied with Regeneration and common to all the Mysteries was the belief in Communion, or Identification with the deity. "It was the great merit of the Mysteries," says Gardner, "that they established and cultivated a communion between the human and the divine, and that they opened ways in which man could draw nearer to God."⁵ "In ecstasy, in the freeing of the soul from the hampering confinement of the body, in its communion with the deity, powers arise within it, it was believed, of which it knows nothing in the daily life hampered by the body. It now becomes free as spirit to hold communion with spirits; also, released from transiency, it is endowed with capacities to behold what only the eyes of the spirit can behold, that which is removed beyond time and space."⁶

The immediate result of Initiation was held to be the vision of God. To it was ascribed a sacramental efficacy which atoned for a man's past, gave him comfort in the present, enabled him to participate in the divine life, and assured to faith an hereafter of dazzling splendour. "The deity of the society was a θεὸς σωτήρ and the society sought through fellowship with him to reach a state of σωτηρία, safety or salvation, a salvation belonging alike to the present life and that beyond the grave.⁷ Multitudes, untouched by the reasonings of Platonism for the immortality of the soul, found in life a new value

⁵Gardner, *Religious Experience of St. Paul*, p. 100.

⁶Rohde, *Psyche*, II., pp. 14-22.

⁷Gardner, *Religious Experience of St. Paul*, p. 82.

as a probation for a blessed hereafter. Initiation was held to make all the difference between the saved and the unsaved of the ancient worshippers. In the *Hymn to Demeter* the Goddess-Mother asserts: 'Happy is he of men on earth who has seen these Mysteries; but the uninitiate, who has no part in these holy things, cannot, when dead and down in the murky gloom, have the portion of such blessings.'⁸

At first sight it seems inexplicable that the Mysteries should have exercised an increasing sway over the Graeco-Roman world. No doubt entrance into the Mysteries was sought by some from base motives. Unscrupulous priests had abundant opportunities of using their office for self-aggrandisement, and some candidates were actuated by curiosity, love of an elaborate ritual, or even by the desire to get a share of the doles made to destitute members. On the other hand, the repeated and severe persecutions by pagan and Christian governments show that there was a strong appeal made by the Mysteries to something in human nature.

The popularity of the Mysteries was due, in the first place, to the mysticism to which they appealed. Two or three centuries before Alexander *Orphism* had invaded the Greek world and sown the seeds of mysticism. It appeared at a time of great social upheaval and shifted the centre of interest from this life to the life beyond. It introduced a theology of Redemption, to be secured by asceticism, and this note never died out of subsequent Greek religion. The Orphic brotherhoods established the practice of voluntary associations for religious purposes, which became pronounced from the days of Alexander. Orphism was also steeped in sacramentarianism, which flooded the later Mysteries and flowed into Christianity.

In the second place, with the rise of Sophism the State-

⁸Cited in Angus, *The Mystery Religions and Christianity*, p. 140.

system of the Mediterranean collapsed, and with it the religion of which it was the expression. The religious instinct in man drove him to look elsewhere for religious support. The Mysteries had in them a power of expansion and the germ of universalism which were lacking in the Olympian theologies.

Another factor conducive to the spread of the Mysteries was the growing influence of the masses and the concern which their demands caused the government circles. In the religious life more than in any other department the lower classes exercised a persistent influence. In the decay of the State-religions they went their own way in search of religion. From the days of the advent of the Great Mother till the adoption of Christianity by Constantine there was a steadily increasing ascendancy of the religious cults and customs adopted by the populace and the authorizing by the government of what in most instances it could not arrest.

From the earliest period of Greek religious history there are traces of the twofold worship of the Olympians, or deities of the sky, and of the chthonian deities of the earth and the underworld. The chthonic cults were secret or close cults, restricted to a family, a tribe, or a locality, the rites of which would suffer profanation by disclosure to outsiders. Hence arose the necessity of a solemn initiation. They were local cults, each one with its own shrine and geographical boundaries. The ritual of the Chthonians formed the model for the Greek ritual of the dead, and the emergence of these chthonic cults was not the least important preparation of the Greek mind for the Mysteries.

The rapid spread and persistence of the Mysteries can be accounted for only by the needs of the age. Yet they failed ultimately. The Mysteries were the last redoubts of paganism to fall. They formed the chief object of attack by the Christian apologists. They were burdened with myths of primitive

naturalism. "All go back to a distant era of barbarism and have inherited from this savage past a multitude of myths, the offensiveness of which might be dissimulated, but not suppressed, by a philosophical symbolism, and of practices of which all the mystic interpretations could but ill conceal the fundamental crassness, the survival of a rude nature-worship."⁹ The Oriental cults attempted to cast off what was repulsive in order to win the West and conform to the deepening moral conscience, but they retained enough of their past to disqualify them for the present. The cult-legends, dating from a non-moral antiquity, were explained as symbols of the life of man and of the deity. Such myths might to the pure-minded become symbols of spiritual truth, but to the majority they were apt to be suggestive of evil. The Mystery-Religions linked themselves with Astrology and Magic, which contributed to their popularity for a time, but undermined their spirituality by fostering credulity. Thus they proved unequal to the contest with Christianity. A living religion must transform the spirit of the age. "We probably realize very inadequately the pernicious effects of astrology and magic in the last age of pagan antiquity. These superstitions were all-pervading, and, except for accidentally stimulating interest in the heavenly bodies, and to a less extent in physics, they did unmitigated harm."¹⁰ Not that the Mysteries were forms of magic rather than religions of propitiation and redemption, but their association with magic undermined their spiritual power. "The Mysteries were never able completely to sever themselves from magic; that is, the *Mystae* usually attached a mysterious efficacy to the mere act of partaking, apart from the motion of will and heart which really gave it the possibility

⁹Cumont, *Religions Orientales*, 2nd ed., pp. 107-8.

¹⁰Inge, *Philosophy of Plotinus*, I, p. 50.

of being efficacious.”¹¹ The Mysteries, as Aristotle detected, appealed to the emotions rather than to the spiritual perceptions, and they were accompanied by a cramping traditionalism. From the beginning their intellectual inferiority was apparent to the educated. Hence an earnest man had to choose between the Mysteries and formulated Greek thought. “Those whose interests were primarily intellectual, or, at all events, demanded a theology which was intellectually acceptable, were strongly influenced by the metaphysic of the Neo-Platonists and the ethics of the Stoics. . . . On the other hand, those whose interest was chiefly religious, in the narrower sense of the word, were attracted by the Oriental Mysteries.”¹²

The Jew and the Christian in the early centuries of our era formed the only societies marked by exclusiveness and intolerance of all other forms of religion. To the Jew the pagan religions seemed to be nothing but a mass of superstition, and the Christian had no sympathy with the prevalent laxity and toleration of other beliefs, not even with the Jewish, which he regarded as superseded by the religion of the Cross. That the mystery-religions, inadequate as they were, yet sprang from a blind desire after the knowledge of God, he was, in the absence of a true historical sense, unable to see. The secrecy which the Mysteries demanded of their votaries seemed to him contrary to the whole spirit of religion, which affirmed that all men have an equal claim to participate in the blessedness of faith. It is true that this faith contained “mysteries”, but not mysteries which were open only to the initiated. What God demanded of men was faith in Himself and in His only begotten Son. It was the very intensity with which the Christian realized the absoluteness of his faith that led him to despise all other claims to the title of religion.

¹¹Gardner, pp. 90-1.

¹²Lake, *The Earliest Epistles of St. Paul*, 2nd ed., p. 40.

Though the Christian Churches were Mysteries in the original sense of the word, since they were societies formed for the purpose of worship, neither their teaching nor their ritual was in itself mysterious. This, however, does not imply that unbaptized persons were in the first four centuries admitted to the celebration of the eucharist. That all men could obtain salvation was openly and zealously proclaimed, but the calumnies that were current as to what took place behind closed doors when Christians met for worship shows that they were so far secret as to be open only to those who had been baptized into the faith. Faith in Christ was the one condition of admittance to the meetings of Christians, a faith of which baptism was the symbol. The essential difference between Christianity and the mystery religions lay in the fact that the latter only required ritual observances, while the sole demand of the former was faith in the Lord.

That the Mysteries had an elevating effect upon their votaries, a fact hidden from the early Christians who had no proper conception of history, seems to be beyond doubt. Diodorus tells us that "those who have taken part in them are said to become more pious, more upright, and in every way better than their former selves."¹³ The Mysteries promised to the initiate happiness after death, while the uninitiated were condemned to "lie in darkness and mud." This happiness was believed to be obtained by means of a spectacle or drama. By initiation, it was maintained, men were freed from the prison-house of the flesh, the method of obtaining this enfranchisement being entirely mechanical.

The early Christian apologists, in their philosophy of religion, were not free from the fallacy that God is entirely beyond knowledge. Clement of Alexandria assumes that God

¹³Cited by Dean Inge in his *Christian Mysticism*, p. 351.

is above Being, and therefore that we cannot know what He is, but only what He is not. This Neoplatonic doctrine was also espoused by Origen, though he inconsistently affirms that God is self-conscious and therefore can be known by our reason, as well as in an ecstatic vision. Dionysius is strongly impregnated with the virus of later Neoplatonism. His view was adopted by the mediaeval mystics, who, however, modified his doctrine under the influence of Aristotelianism. Victorinus, in his explanation of the Trinity, anticipates the later philosophical mystics. The Father, he says, eternally knows Himself in the Son, and the Son is the self-objectification of the Father, while the Holy Ghost is the "bond" of the Trinity. Augustine, though he cannot be called a mystic, at times uses the language of the mystic, as when he says that God is above all that can be said of Him. John Scotus Erigena, in the ninth century, is a mystic only by his intellectual affinities. He is the father, not only of Western Mysticism, but of Rationalism as well. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries several writers, of whom Hugo and Richard of St. Victor are the most prominent, attempted to combine Scholasticism and Mysticism. They did not despise Reason, but they laid a strong emphasis on ecstatic contemplation as a supra-rational faculty. The opposition of the natural and the supernatural is characteristic of Catholic Mysticism. The faculty by which we apprehend God is held to have no relation to Reason. The short treatise of Albertus Magnus, entitled *De Adhaerendo Deo*, shows that Mediaeval Catholicism had committed itself to the fatal "negative road," which leads nowhere.

Meister Eckhardt may be regarded as the greatest of the speculative mystics. He seeks to find a reasoned basis for the doctrines of the Church. The Godhead he distinguishes from God. Being 'formless' it cannot be an object of knowledge or of worship. From it is evolved the triune God. The Son

is the Word of the Father, and the Holy Spirit is the "flower of the Divine Tree,—the mutual Love which unites the Father and the Son." The generation of the Son is a continual process. The three Persons are inherent in the Godhead, and there never was a time when the Son was not.

Mysticism has often been identified with Pantheism, but in reality they are fundamentally different. The mystic denies that from the true point of view the world as such has any reality, while the pantheist only denies its independent existence, maintaining that in it the Infinite is directly present in all its fullness. Religion implies the reality of a single principle, and it was therefore natural that the very intensity of the consciousness of the Infinite should lead to the denial of any reality of the Finite. But when God is conceived as beyond all definite thought, and therefore as absolutely inexpressible, the logical result is to empty the Absolute of all definiteness, and thus to make it indistinguishable from pure Being, which again is indistinguishable in its abstraction from pure Nothing. As a matter of fact Christian theology has never entirely freed itself from this prepossession. The world is no mere assemblage of objects in space and time, as Pantheism assumes, but presupposes a single rational principle of which nature is an inadequate expression. Nor can it be maintained that mind in us is by itself real; for mind in us comes to self-consciousness only in the comprehension of the world as an embodiment of a supreme reason. The doctrine of such thinkers as Herbert Spencer and others, who first conceive of Matter and Mind as two parallel but independent modes of being, and then seek to unite them by means of an unknowable Power of which both are equally manifestations, leads to the same abyss of nonentity. God cannot be conceived as a separate and independent Being who stands apart from the world and only acts externally upon it. The peculiarity

of Mysticism is not that it emphasizes the relation of the individual soul to God, but that it would abolish all other relations. Just because it separates God from the world, Mysticism is unable to affirm anything positive of the divine nature. If God is beyond being and beyond knowledge, even the distinction of God as Being and God as Knowing Himself disappears. If it were possible for us to transcend the distinction of self and not-self, as the mystic claims, we should at the same time destroy the consciousness of the divine as the unity which comprehends both. So engrossed is the mystic in the consciousness of the divine, that he loses sight of its manifestations, and thus confuses the absence of all abrupt contrasts with the absence of all distinctions. While man can never escape from the consciousness, implicit or explicit, of the divine principle which gives meaning to all his experience, it is only when this principle is grasped in its complete and final form that it reveals itself as self-conscious and rational. The divine nature must be conceived, not as absolutely self-centred and self-enclosed, but as pouring itself forth in infinite prodigality. Mysticism gives a very inadequate support to the development of the moral consciousness, because it does not recognize the essential identity of all mankind. It leads to an over-estimation of the contemplative life and may even result in the entire evaporation of religion in a super-rational ecstasy, which at the most merely encourages a few choice spirits to indulge in the luxury of a refined spirituality. Christianity in its essence is a religion of humanity, and provides the only adequate support for the moral consciousness, refusing, as it does, to separate the service of humanity from the service of God, or the service of God from the service of humanity.

CO-OPERATIVE GOVERNMENT IN CANADA

BY J. S. WOODSWORTH, M.P.

“**D**EMOCRATIC institutions are doomed”—so we are being told. Dictatorship of some kind—Communist, Fascist, or Industrial-Financial—is inevitable. Perhaps!

Yet our so-called democratic institutions are, after all, feudal-bourgeois institutions still in the course of transformation. Democracy, as we now conceive it, is still something that lies ahead. In the meantime we are living under these so-called democratic institutions. We must deal with them; possibly we may work through them. At any rate, we may study them and learn how they operate in actual practice. Possibly even minor modifications might produce far-reaching results. Such is our approach to our subject.

Numerous important aspects press for consideration. The successful marking of democratic institutions demands a politically-conscious, an educated and alert public. Who will declare that this has yet been attained in Canada? One needs but go through an election campaign to despair almost of democracy. The majority of the electors are so indifferent, so ignorant of the real issues, so easily swayed by catch-phrases, so intent on immediate personal gains that one wonders if we have not a better government than we really deserve.

Political education is most hap-hazard. Even our schools and universities do little to fit one for taking his part in public affairs. Some of us have learned how difficult it is to keep well informed even with our own constituencies.

The election of representatives by the plan of dividing the country into geographical constituencies is far from ideal.

Without entering upon the theoretical arguments advanced by writers like Cole and the Webbs, let me point out that when important questions arise, the Government frequently summons representatives of the leading groups—the bankers, the railroad executives, the manufacturers, the farmers, labour. Such a conference is more truly democratic than Parliament.

Leaving aside deliberate gerrymandering, how is it possible for the needs of half a dozen small manufacturing towns and a large agricultural community to be “represented” by one man? Only a lawyer would profess to be able to do it! The miners of Alberta, for instance, whose interests ought to be represented in Parliament, are scattered through six federal constituencies, all predominantly agricultural. How can the men in these isolated camps have any real voice in the control of public policies? Is it any wonder that there is a resort to “direct action”? Without changing fundamentally our electoral system it is probable that proportional representation, intelligently applied, might help considerably.

Then there is the selection and election of candidates. Again we have the form of democracy but only the form. The party machines, supported by large campaign funds, largely determine who will sit in Parliament. The people “decide,” of course, but decide only between the two party nominees. Their decision in turn is determined by the amount of money that the party can spare for propaganda and electioneering expenses in that particular constituency. Again let me suggest that it is remarkable that our members of Parliament are such a decent lot!

We merely call attention to these aspects of our subject and pass on to a consideration of the Parliamentary machine as it actually operates. At present we have at Ottawa four parties: Conservatives, Liberals (of two schools), Farmers and

Labour—the last two co-operating closely. We speak of our system as responsible government but, in reality, the Government is responsible not to Parliament but to the party that is able to command the support of the majority in the House. Theoretically the Government may be defeated by a vote of the House. I think that is still taught in our college text-books. In practice, the party discipline overrides constitutional fictions. In my nine years experience, only two men have voted against their party on an important question and in each case this meant political suicide.

After the election, then, the party is in the saddle and the Prime Minister is virtually a Dictator. I do not wish to overstate but, so far as I can learn, cabinet responsibility is largely cabinet subserviency and the caucus a convenient method of issuing an advance copy of cabinet decisions and permitting the blowing off of steam in private.

Consider the powers of the Government. The Government—not Parliament—is in control of all departments, appoints all commissions, even such important boards as that of the Canadian National Railway; appoints lieutenant-governors; fills vacancies in the Senate; appoints judges; sends representatives to the Imperial Conference and to the League of Nations thus deciding our policies on external affairs; initiates all money bills; practically controls the business of the House; exercises patronage in positions and contracts, and issues Orders-in-Council sometimes more far-reaching than legislation. Government, i.e. the party in power speaking through the Prime Minister, thus “runs the country.” In the House of Commons, the Government supporters are reduced to silence and the Opposition to impotence. The recent Special Session met, of course, under exceptional conditions—the emergency nature of the session limiting the business and the imminence of the Economic Conference limiting the time, but

these exceptional conditions simply threw into bold relief the real nature of party government. Mr. Bennett, assisted by Mr. Ryckman, with the solid support of a large majority fresh from an election, dominated the situation—their followers silent, their opponents powerless.

Under these conditions there can be no betting on the results of a vote. The tally is known in advance—at least by the whips who keep tab on the absentees and have arranged “pairs” for them. Here again, the exception proves the rule. In one division precipitated by a radical amendment proposed by the Independent Groups these groups apparently had the support of a French-Canadian Liberal who was “paired” with a Conservative. But this was a “standing pair” and since, in this case, the Liberals had voted with the Conservatives the ordinary arrangements of the pairing system were completely thrown out of gear!

In becoming mere automatons, the members are not, as often charged, “mere hypocrites.” They are pledged to party loyalty—“theirs not to reason why.” On this tacit understanding they accepted the party nomination and support; indeed they are thoroughly in sympathy with the general policy of the party—certainly in contrast with that of the rival party. Sometimes members of an independent mind compromise by going so far as to abstain from voting—if the division is not a critical one—and even to speak in favour of a motion which if “pressed to a vote” they are bound to oppose. For this reason Parliamentary debates are very unreal. No one expects to make any converts. The whole performance is for the sake of the outside public. Everyone “talks for Hansard” and even more to the press gallery. And this quite properly, for the only hope is that of influencing public opinion and thus indirectly bringing pressure to bear upon the House. Such pressure is effective—even in Canada. But there is a

very decided "time-lag." Perhaps that is the real reason for our debates being so prolonged.

But the party fight in Parliament is not primarily over this or that measure but rather one for power. So long as one party has the monopoly of power, of "the sweets and emoluments of office," so long will that party attempt to retain power and the rival party seek to dislodge it from office. The particular measures are more or less the counters in the game; the whole elaborate machinery of the debates a costly stage performance designed to influence public opinion.

As Mr. F. S. Oliver points out in his searching if somewhat cynical study, *The Endless Adventure*, the British blend of representative with party government leaves a politician no choice but to use his best endeavours to ruin his opponents. "It has been said—no doubt with some exaggeration—that the greatest politicians have neither morals nor malice in their composition. They make the most outrageous charges against one another, and they fully intend that the public shall believe these charges. But as they do not themselves believe them they find it very difficult to hate one another cordially and everlastingly, as high-minded country gentlemen so often do who have quarrelled over a boundary fence."

In the middle ages morality plays were undoubtedly of great value. To-day we have developed other means of forming opinion. Possibly one of these days the political play will cease to attract public attention and the way will be open for replacing it by a business administration.

In the meantime, the entrance of third and fourth parties introduces rather incalculable and troublesome factors. The Independents may throw their influence and votes this way or that, deciding perhaps on the merits of the measure rather than because of party—at least old party—considerations. They may hold the balance of power as in 1925. They themselves

may be divided. The rules of the game were designed for a two-party system; the injection of a third party queers the whole procedure of the House. I recall several years ago when only one amendment to the budget was possible, that I introduced an amendment and forced the Opposition to vote with the Government!

No wonder both the old parties decry the coming of the groups; their growth would probably lead to the break up of the party system and meanwhile is—to say the least—decidedly inconvenient.

But if the presence of more than two parties is undesirable, why *two* parties—why not only one? Of course there will always be diversities of interests and viewpoints but why one party with all official power and another with none? We can understand the historical development of the two party system. In England, with government just extending beyond its police functions, the Conservatives in a general way represented the landed proprietors, and the Liberals the trading and later the manufacturing classes, with the great masses of the people without a voice in government. But even in England there was the Irish party and more recently with the growing economic power of Labour has come the rapid rise of the Labour party. No, “two” is not a sacred number. Several years ago, in the report of a commission, headed by Lord Donoughmore, on a possible constitution for the Island of Ceylon, there was a frank recognition that certain constitutional changes in our party system were probably desirable. The report and its suggestions are worth careful study.

In our municipal bodies, some of them conducting a larger volume of business than a province—the party system is not recognized. In the League of Nations, where there are wide diversities and great inequalities, the work is carried on by means of committees and with no lack of criticism. In our own House of Commons committees, members are selected

on a proportional basis and it is significant that discussion generally cuts right across party lines. Only in the Executive committee of the House do we rigidly exclude all but members of one party and force all the other members into opposition. Again let me repeat that only by discounting the measures prepared by the Government can the Opposition hope to attain the coveted position of power.

Of course, it is said that a party stands for certain principles and when in the majority has a mandate from the people to carry out certain policies. Again largely theoretical nonsense—divorced from all reality! Last spring a Labour amendment was introduced proposing that tariff privileges should be made contingent on the maintenance of the provisions of the Versailles Treaty in the industries affected. This was supported by the Conservatives and voted down by the Liberals. Five months later the rôles were reversed; a similar resolution was supported by the Liberals and voted down by the Conservatives.

As to a mandate, there are usually only two or three main issues before the electorate—these perhaps varying according to locality. In the course of a Parliamentary session hundreds of important items come up for consideration and decision. On each the Government must take a stand. Has it a mandate? On some more contentious question where a “free vote” is permitted, the results show very clearly the wide divergencies within the party. If there are clearly defined differences of interests and opinion in the country, surely it is well that these should find expression on the floor of the House—even if their effective expression involves the formation of groups or blocs. And if there are groups or parties in the House why, in turn, should these not be represented in the Executive?

Here we are met with another theoretical sacrosanct idea—Cabinet solidarity as identical with Cabinet responsibility. In this instance “one”—instead of “two”—has become a sacred

number. But why should the Cabinet speak with one voice on all sorts of questions? Either the members of Cabinet really think the same thing or they do not; in either case the arrangement is morally vicious.

In a committee we fight for our point of view, are forced to accept the findings of the majority but feel free to express our opinion on the floor of the House. Only in extreme cases do we feel that this necessitates resignation from the committee. Why should not such a procedure be possible even in the Cabinet? If the Cabinet were composed of members from all sections of the House, selected by some method of proportional representation, this procedure would be the regular one. There would then be reality in debates and in votes, and party considerations would not prevent measures being discussed on their merits.

This may seem a long way ahead. The presence of strong groups in the House is probably necessary to force the issue. Without any radical changes, a great advance would be made if it could be understood that an adverse vote on a Government measure was not necessarily a vote of lack of confidence. Here again the existence of a third party has helped to show the absurdity of the existing practice. When the Liberals were in power and presented a fairly low tariff budget (not the Dunning budget) the United Farmers of Alberta might introduce an amendment urging a still lower tariff. This, if carried, would defeat the Liberals and put into power a professedly high tariff party. In case of a close vote the low tariff advocates might well hesitate to back up their opinions by their votes. If high-principled, clear-headed independents are reduced to such straits, what confusion must exist in the minds of the electors unversed in the intricacies of the game?

The slogan "Time for a change" may win an election. One wishes it might revise our constitution and practice.

CANADA LOOKS AT THE BOOK CLUBS

BY WILLIAM McRAE FAWCETT

HOWEVER violently Canadians may disagree over the extent of the influence of the United States on Canada, they are generally unanimous in admitting that there is, at least, some influence. They are generally unanimous, too, in admitting that, such influence being present, interest in the doings of the United States is modified from a mere neighbourly interest to a deeper, personal one. Seldom is there a day that does not speak a new scene on the other side of the fence and, while Canadians gaze across at each new presentation as one being enacted by their neighbours, they know it is not at all improbable that, some day, it will be enacted by themselves.

Canada, then, is quite interested in the doings of the United States. It is not unfair to say this, though it might be unfair to say what some critics seem to imply from such a statement, namely, that Canada is an indolent old nation, so lacking in ambition that she does nothing but placidly imitate all she sees in all respects. False as this implication is in itself, there is a separate objection. It too readily opens itself to the rejoinder that, granted for a moment there is this weak, Canadian imitation, Canada is certainly to be congratulated on her shrewd discrimination in recognizing what can benefit her. Not only does Canada accept but she rejects, and, when she accepts, almost invariably she benefits.

In view of this, is there any indication that Canada was quite indifferent to the Book-Club war that was waged last year, because she looked on in silence? A year has passed since the first broadsides were fired at Book-Clubs and counter-

attacks inaugurated by Club supporters and, though the battle has somewhat abated, there is at the present time more provocation than ever before. On March 6th, 1930, the Literary Guild of America, celebrating its third anniversary, could say that its membership had increased almost one hundred per cent. during the previous year, while Book-Clubs in general all over the country can point to an increase in power and prestige that is really phenomenal. If Canada were indifferent to the Book-Club battle, she could ill afford to remain so. But Canada is not indifferent. What, then, is her attitude? Does she approve or disapprove of them?

In offering an observation or two, it seems well to divide Canadians into two classes, readers and writers, just as these two classes are differently affected by the question. In regard to readers, various representative sentiments coming to notice suggest that there exists that commonest divergence of opinion, the two extreme opinions and the mean. There are some who unconditionally support the Clubs in their argument. At great length, they offer thanks for *Point Counter Point* or *Tristram* or *Trader Horn*, and argue that they would never have come across these books had it not been for the assistance of the Book-Clubs. They watch Book-Club memberships swell and advance as one might watch a noble crusade progress, weeding out mediocrity and nourishing superiority as it goes along. Then there is the other group which views the movement with the opposing feelings of bitterness and alarm. This group sees in the movement not a noble crusade but a steam-roller expedition, bent on crushing the life not only out of publishers and booksellers but out of writers, critics, and such. It looks lamentably, too, at the after-effect, stereotyped reading, and it questions the integrity of any person who assumes unto himself the function of stereotyper.

Between these two groups, the minority, lies the largest

group, the majority. This group is not passionately given to one cause or the other, seeing in the Clubs some things that are undesirable, but, at the same time, some things that are welcome. It contends that Canada will never sponsor such a Club as the Literary Guild of America nor adopt certain of its American principles, but from the midst of such statements has come the story of an international Club, one that would choose not eleven or twelve American books but three American, three English, and three Canadian. If this were to happen, it would at least alleviate the sting of national conscience when potential readers of Canadian works accept the dicta of American Clubs and read non-Canadian works.

How far, at the present time, have Canadian readers expressed their feeling by their actions? In other words, how far are they tangibly interested?

Having regard to all circumstances, Canada has at the present time no Book-Club as formidable as any one of the three foremost American Clubs. England has. But there are in Canada over fifteen thousand believers in Book-Clubs. There are, at least, that many who subscribe their name and money to them. Some nine thousand pay allegiance to Canadian Clubs and six thousand to American. The Canadian Clubs, for the most part, are conducted by booksellers. Their pronouncements follow careful deliberations quite after the fashion of their American prototypes, and are as much respected by Canadians, but Canadian Clubs are rather "Clubs in Canada," neglecting as they do Canadian writers. Canadian subscribers to American Clubs follow the same rules and regulations that are set down for American subscribers. Most of these subscribers are gathered by advertisements in the American literary publications that have a wide circulation in Canada.

The Book-Club idea did not originate in the United States

so that, however much it may ultimately affect the thoughts and actions of Canadians, they should not thank or blame that country entirely. It came with the *Volksverband der Bücherfreunde*, a Berlin guild, which sprang into prominence after the Great War and which to-day is one of the largest in the world. This *Volksverband der Bücherfreunde* afforded American enterprise its pattern though the chief characteristic of the German guild, in fact its caricature, price-cutting, was not so extensively adopted. Clubs on this continent preferred smaller cuts with more emphasis on the advantages that accrue from an exceptionally high class judiciary board. Not unlike some over-advertised tooth-pastes that are "for the gums" but will help the teeth, the Book-of-the-Month Club came to offer a first-class selection of reading matter, incidentally throwing in a discount of ten cents to one dollar per book, postage extra. The Literary Guild of America and the Book League of America also began by emphasizing the personnel of their judges. The former now requires members to contract for a minimum of twelve books per year with a charge of twenty-one dollars, while the latter offers its members twenty-four books, twelve standard works and twelve modern, for the fee of eighteen dollars. Both Clubs send out private editions, the Guild edition being, of course, much the handsomer of the two.

These three Clubs are the most powerful on this side of the Atlantic. The Paper Book Club deserves mention as the outstanding and isolated example of German price-cutting ideas. It buys the rights to a private edition, prints the edition about as cheaply as possible, and offers it at a cost to its subscribers of less than fifty cents per book, the yearly membership fee of five dollars allowing one book per month.

It is not hard to picture booksellers, in view of these facts, taking up the cudgel against Book-Clubs nor is it hard to think of publishers themselves lining up in opposition, but

booksellers and publishers are not wholly responsible for the vociferous revolt of last year. They merely did the awakening under the leadership of one John Macrae, president of the Dutton Publishing House. When the Book-of-the-Month Club chose *The Cradle of the Deep*, a sugared collection of sea stories by Joan Lowell, he went forth and questioned the choice, sending an open letter to publications all over the country. He contended that Henry Williamson's novel, *The Pathway*, was of a quality decidedly superior to the Lowell book. In this contention he was immediately upheld by certain critics and quite a clamour ensued.

One argument put forth was that two or three of these Clubs, the larger ones, were headed for downright dictatorship; being able to guarantee a sale of one hundred thousand books, they had demanded and were already receiving as much as a seventy per cent. discount or one hundred per cent. more than the regular booksellers received. It was also argued that each Club, by the very fact that it imperially vested itself with the power of selection, was forcing certain books "down the throat of the public." The refutation attempted by one Book-Club was a citation of the exchange privilege. Each subscriber was entitled to receive the selections of the judges but if, at any time, he preferred a different book, he simply returned the selection of the judges and received what he wanted, paying a small additional fee. As an example of this, the case of Seabrooke's *The Magic Island*, in which there were one hundred and twenty-five exchanges, was quoted.

A third argument scorned the presumptuousness of Clubs in thinking their judges infallible. The very prerequisite of infallibility was lacking, it was pointed out, because no five judges could read all the books published. It also questioned the critical integrity of the judges. Did they give the people meritorious literature or did they give them what would most

readily appeal? Was it an uplifting effort or veiled commercialism, an exploitation of the public and its well-known weaknesses? Robert K. Haas, president of the Book-of-the-Month Club, endeavoured to clear the air by distinguishing between the business department and the critical department of his Club.

"All books are sent along by us to an Elimination Committee, directly under the control and supervision of Dr. Canby," he said. Such of them as are considered worthy are then passed along to all the members of the Selecting Committee. The business management, as has been publicly stated, has nothing to do with the choice of books."

And again—

"Henry Seidel Canby, Dorothy Canfield, Heywood Broun, William Allen White, and Christopher Morley are, every one, sincere, highly qualified judges. If the business management were to push them in their choice, they would resign."

From the nature of the subject and the arguments advanced the enthusiasm of American readers over one cause or the other can be understood readily. Canadian readers, while they show interest in the subject as one that has already concerned them and one that bids fair to concern them more and more, look at the argument, as has been suggested, less passionately. The majority do not see in the Clubs the cold commercialism, monopoly, and menace which some have so often decried but it is untrue that they see in them the panacea of literary ills. While, conceivably, Clubs could expand and form an International-Mond merger all their own, Canadians do not believe it will come about. Clubs are sufficiently discerning to realize that, in doing such a thing, they would hurt only themselves, especially by alienating the good-will of their reading public.

On the one hand, Canadians believe that Book-Clubs are entitled to a larger discount than that given to booksellers. Few cavil over this because they realize that Clubs have done what no bookseller ever did. They have hired boards of judges to select outstanding literary work. Such boards, however ineffective they may be, are entitled to some remuneration for their pains and Canadians will grant it to them without questioning as long as they continue to bring good literature to the people who have not the means or time to find it themselves, as long as they continue to spread more widely, as they have done in some cases, literature that deserves wider circulation, and as long as they continue to stem the admittedly serious over-production of the printed word.

Many Canadian readers, on the other hand, think Book-Clubs have aggravated unduly certain of the country's literary ills. The Literary Guild of America comes forth and says its choice is "the latest and best in America," the Book-of-the-Month Club comes forth and says its choice is the "best thought and writing of our day," the Book League of America comes forth and says the same thing in different words, followed by others until half a dozen Clubs claim their choice is the best. This spirit of supererogation has actuated Americans in several other things but it will never do, Canadians believe, to apply it to the strained condition of American letters. Thus it was that Canadians did not sigh for the less fortunate contemporaries of Vina Delmar when an eminent Club declared her book, *Bad Girl*, to be the "best" book of the month. They sighed rather for the eminent Club, as in fact they sigh for all Clubs that display such intemperance. In spite of one or two good points in the book, it would have been better for a work like *Bad Girl* to have remained a begging manuscript under its cruder title, *Ten Lunar Moons*, than to have been published and gloriously called the "best" book of the month.

Then there are Canadian writers. Their attitude is one of opposition rather than one of conditional neutrality like that of Canadian readers. The obvious reason for this is that they are more affected by Book-Clubs than are Canadian readers. Possessing much in common, they have one or two points of opposition that are the same, especially in their antipathy to American intemperance—which, by the way, they do not label as commercialism—in sounding superlative praises for particular books and in selecting, among the number of such books, those that are written according to the extremer schools of thought. Canadian writers are not given to extremes. They realize that, no matter how the pendulum may swing, it always comes to rest in the centre. This is why so few favoured the bare Naturalism that attracted many American writers. Anyone who goes through Canadian works in the hope of finding a Theodore Dreiser, a Eugene O'Neill, a Sherwood Anderson, or a Sinclair Lewis, is likely to be disappointed, finding in their stead a Louis Hemon, a William Kirby, a Mazo de la Roche, or a Gilbert Parker. These writers saw the excess of Naturalism and, to-day, they can smile as the pendulum gathers momentum in a swing to the opposite direction, Humanism.

But Canadian writers do not look on what they consider American excess without benefiting by it. The shrewder have come to see how they can benefit not only by observing American experiments or by observing English experiments but also by observing the experiments of both countries, taking this and rejecting that as they see fit. Some, like Morley Callaghan, enter whole-heartedly and faithfully into these experiments, but they are few. The great majority can be counted on, not to stand unprogressively by the Old School, but to venture forth with the Old School in sight. Then, there is less danger of becoming lost.

Canadian writers are opposed to Book-Clubs on economic grounds. By absorbing the Canadian reading public, the Clubs are taking away the only reading public on which Canadian writers can naturally depend. Never can they hope, as Canadian writers, to depend on American readers. If Canada is to have a literature of her own or if she is to keep a literature that already is her own, she must have national readers.

And Canadians ask themselves if Americans care. Innumerable American magazines have come and are still coming into Canada and circulating to the detriment of Canadian publications. It is the same with American books. While writers have refused to oppose the situation publicly, there is every indication that they will if the situation becomes worse. Book-Clubs, then, when they campaign in Canada and ally Canadians in large numbers to their cause, are arousing bad feelings, especially when it is considered that they bear with them every promise of campaigning in the future and of allying in the future on a larger scale than ever before.

What are the figures? During the past few years, according to one American publisher, Book-Clubs raised the sale of the best-sellers from 100,000 or 200,000 books per year to 800,000 books per year. It is likely that the sale of best-sellers increased proportionately in Canada which is equivalent to saying that their sale in Canada quadrupled. Is it to be inferred from this that Canadians have quadrupled literary expenditures all along the line or merely that they transferred what was formerly spent on one or two classes of literature to one class, the best-sellers? From this it would appear that many Canadians bought books who had never bought them before. By means of educative campaigns, Book-Clubs played a large part in bringing about this result and they are to be congratulated accordingly, but the Clubs also, in the process

of increasing their sales, deprived Canadian authors and publishers of a vast amount of money which, ordinarily, they would have received.

Finally, new Canadian writers see in Book-Clubs a menace to themselves. To be deprived of only a small portion of their national field is, they point out, too apt to be calamitous for them. If the sales from a first publication are not large enough, a later work will go unpublished, for publishers, when they see potential readers falling away, are not going to take the chances that they would otherwise take. On the other hand, it is pointed out, if the fifteen or twenty thousand subscribers to Clubs were free from their Club obligations, a sufficient number of buyers could be obtained among them to turn a failure, not necessarily into a success, but probably into a guarantee of another chance. A few hundred additional sales are very often all that is necessary.

Looking to the future, the observer has to admit that there is *something* "on the books." The Book-Club idea appears destined to modify, if not to upset, all prevalent book-selling methods. Promotional advertising will confine itself to one or two works rather than to ten or twelve as it now does. Emphasis, it seems, will be placed on the flaming genius of this or that writer who is fortunate enough to achieve success with one throw; it will ignore the unkindled genius of another writer, less fortunate, who throws and fails—but who can not throw again.

RETURNING

BY A. M. STEPHEN

To-day the world glides dreamily
Through tangled golden roads of space.
A fair ship on a boundless sea,
Its languid sails are set to trace
The byways of eternity.

Time is forgotten. Only light
And drowsy peace hold sovran sway.
Sleep falls unfolded from the height
Of clear skies arched to hold the day
That moves in beauty tranced and white.

The firewood's flame, in whorls of air,
Leans to the bracken's fronded breast,
And amorous breathings wander there
Above the green, warm leafage pressed
About a brown stump gnarled and bare.

Earth draws me with maternal bands.
Its kiss is wet upon my brow.
A brooding presence, Summer stands—
Lets down the bars 'twixt Then and Now
To lay the dead Past in my hand.

A deep, bright calm this memory brings,
Ontario's wine of wind and sun,
Blue diamonds on a swallow's wings,
Tall poplars, shimmering, cobwebs spun
From childhood's vagrant love of things,
The old barn's dusty fragrant air
Through chinks where twisted sunbeams fell
On clover blossoms, and the lair
Where gnomes and giants cast a spell
Beneath the darkness of a stair,

The din of sparrows in the eaves,
Trim larkspurs by the kitchen door,
A robin shaking song through leaves
That rippled while his gladness bore
A note no sigh of mine retrieves.

These come to me to-day. The hand
Of Summer brushes back the years
Along the path which fate has planned.
My heart goes back, through mist of tears,
To Edens in a distant land.

OCTOBER DAYS

BY A. M. STEPHEN

Softly, from aerial heights,
Limpid, clear as a snowflake,
Curving to pale gold horizons,
The sky is a veil of enchantment.

Black, limned on tremulous curtains,
Pencilled patterns on saffron,
Crowning the hill-crest with beauty,
The trees stand hushed in the silence.

Brown limbed, the wood-nymph, October,
Passes, light as a blown leaf,
Winging through valleys of coolness
And shadows dim and forsaken.

Dropped through the slumber of air,
Dreams fall as a ripe nut,
Resting on red leaves and golden,
The remnant of summer's illusion.

Quietly, from passionate flights,
Pausing, my soul, as a mirror,
Gladly enfolds the chaste vision—
A breath before dawn of fulfilment.

THE PRIVY COUNCIL AND MINORITY RIGHTS

By F. R. SCOTT

THE question of the abolition of the Privy Council appeal is one which never ceases to provide Canadians with a topic for argument and discussion. A definite move to do away with the appeal was made at the time of the creation of the Canadian Supreme Court in 1875,¹ and since that date the subject has received periodic and sometimes lively attention. Formerly proposals for abolition were stimulated chiefly by unpopular or confusing judgments; of recent years the advocates of abolition, while by no means lacking this stimulus, have based themselves rather on the ground that the appeal is a symbol of colonial dependence which conflicts with the fact of Canada's national status, and that there is no more reason for any non-Canadian body having the final word upon our law than that it should determine our politics or our industrial life. It appears obvious that at some time or other Canada will have to assume complete control of every sphere of her national activity; the problem becomes one of deciding at what moment the change must be made, and how it can be effected without disturbing certain essential features of our constitution.

It is not the purpose of the present writer to rehearse all the arguments for and against the Privy Council appeal. The matter has recently been debated anew in these pages,² and anyone who desires to inform himself of the pros and cons of the question will find no lack of material there and in other

¹A clause to this effect was inserted in the Bill, and withdrawn on the announcement that the royal assent would not be given if the provision remained. Kennedy, *The Constitution of Canada*, p. 341.

²Vol. XXXVII, p. 456 ff.

Canadian publications. It is proposed to consider one argument frequently put forward in defence of the present system of appeals, and certainly the one which receives the widest degree of popular support in the Province of Quebec. This is the argument that the Privy Council is the defender of minority rights.

Those who hold this view look upon the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as the umpire of the Canadian constitution, a referee who sees that justice is done as between majority and minority. The Canadian Supreme Court, they say, composed as it is of judges only two of whom are chosen from the Province of Quebec, must always represent the majority opinion in the Dominion, and therefore when any matter comes up for decision in which minority rights are involved a really impartial judgment can hardly be expected. On the other hand it is argued that the Privy Council, in its cool and distant chambers, can view our little animosities from an Olympian height, and dispense with ease and magnanimity a superior, almost divine justice. Thus the spirit of equality and fairness on which Confederation was based is preserved by the appeal, and Canada is saved from the internal strife which the suspicion of prejudice in the decisions of the Supreme Court would inevitably provoke. The Privy Council, in other words, is endowed by this theory with all the characteristics which Canadians would like a final court of appeal to possess if they could create an ideal one for the working of their legal and constitutional system.

How far does this theory of the function of the Privy Council fit the facts of Canadian judicial history? The Judicial Committee and the Canadian Supreme Court have now been delivering judgments contemporaneously upon Canadian law for sixty-five years, so that there has been plenty of opportunity of testing which of the two has shown the more

consideration for the claims of the minority in the Dominion. Of course it is impossible to discover the motives that may have influenced a particular judge or court in giving a particular decision, and any attempt to weigh degrees of partiality would be quite valueless. Results may be weighed, nevertheless, without imputing praise or blame, and it will be valuable to analyse the principal decisions which have actually been rendered by the Privy Council and the Supreme Court in cases dealing with racial and religious issues, and to discover in which of the two courts the claims of the minority appear to have received the greater satisfaction. We shall then be in a position to decide whether or not the existence of the appeal has been of any real value to the French-Catholic minority.

Of all the legal disputes which have closely concerned minority rights, those arising under section 93 of the British North America Act, in which is preserved the right of minorities to protection of their educational privileges, have always occasioned the greatest controversy. The first important case under this section arose out of the passing by the Legislature of New Brunswick of the Common School Act of 1871, which created non-sectarian public schools for the province. Previous to this enactment there had been in existence in the Province a system of Parish Schools of an undenominational nature which by tacit agreement had been allowed to assume a Catholic character in every district in which the majority were of that faith. With the disappearance of the Parish Schools the Catholics saw that they would lose this form of unofficial control in the Catholic districts, and they consequently opposed the new Act on this ground. The Supreme Court of New Brunswick³ upheld the statute as being within the powers of the provincial legislature, and this judgment was approved by

³Exparte Renaud, 2 Cartwright, 445.

the Privy Council in another case,⁴ where it was pointed out that the section protected legal privileges only, and not *de facto* privileges such as the Catholics in the province had been enjoying. The Canadian Supreme Court was not then in existence, so it is impossible to say what view it would have taken of the matter, but the point remains that the claims of the minority were not accepted by the Judicial Committee.

The next matter under dispute was the famous Manitoba School Act of 1890. The bitter animosity aroused by this Act, the great and unfortunate gulf which it created at the time between the two races, need not be referred to here save as proof that if ever the Protestant majority on the bench of the Canadian Supreme Court might be expected to show its religious and racial prejudices, this was the moment *par excellence*. And what was the result? By a unanimous decision,⁵ the court declared the Act to be unconstitutional, as it deprived Catholics of the right to have their children taught according to the rules of their Church and compelled them to contribute to the support of schools to which they could not conscientiously send their children. Protestant feeling throughout the country was thus completely ignored. Not a single English-speaking judge opposed the Catholic contention; what is more, the Chief Justice, Sir William Ritchie, was the judge who had sat as chief justice of the New Brunswick court in the Renaud case. By this decision the highest Canadian Court vindicated its right to be considered a truly impartial court of justice.

The subsequent history of the controversy is well known. The Privy Council overruled the decision of the Supreme Court⁶, and, contrary to the wishes of every Catholic, declared

⁴Maher v. Town of Portland, 2 Cartwright, 486 note.

⁵Barrett v. Winnipeg, 19 S.C.R., 374.

⁶Winnipeg v. Barrett, 1892, A.C., 445.

the Act to be *intra vires*. Two years later the question arose as to whether, although the Act was valid, there could be an appeal to the Dominion Government by the disapproving minority in view of other provisions of section 93. On this point the Canadian Supreme Court showed considerable difference of opinion.⁷ Taschereau and Gwynne JJ. considered that the matter was already disposed of by the earlier Privy Council judgment, and that no such appeal was possible; Ritchie, C.J., reached the same conclusion on other grounds; Fournier and King JJ. considered that there was an appeal. It is obvious that the court did not divide along racial or religious lines, and that the Privy Council judgment had confused the issue. When this second question reached the Privy Council the right to appeal to the Dominion Government was upheld,⁸ to the great satisfaction of French Canada. But if the Supreme Court had been the final court of appeal in this legal battle there would have been a complete victory for the minority claims, since the Manitoba Act would have been invalidated in the first place and therefore no appeal to the Dominion Government would have been necessary. As it was Manitoba kept her public schools and the minority had to accept the Laurier compromise.

No other important question turning upon section 93 of the British North America Act came before the Privy Council until the Ontario Regulation 17, which restricted the use of the French language in certain Ontario schools, was attacked. This dispute did not reach the Canadian Supreme Court, being taken direct to London from the Ontario Courts, and we do not know what attitude would have been adopted by the highest Canadian judges. The Judicial Committee, however, upheld the Regulation,⁹ so the minority contention could not

⁷22 S.C.R., 577.

⁸Brophy v. Manitoba, 1895, A.C., 202.

⁹Ottawa Separate School Trustees v. Mackell, 1917, A.C., 62.

have fared worse. Moreover, their Lordships took occasion to remark in the course of their judgment that the use of the French language in matters of education was not a "natural right" vested in the French-speaking population and protected by the Act of 1867, the only rights so protected being, in their opinion, religious and not linguistic, thus disposing legally of a contention not infrequently put forward, that the use of their language is guaranteed generally by the British North America Act to French-Canadians throughout the Dominion.¹⁰

On a second case arising out of the same issue¹¹ the Privy Council decided that the Ontario Legislature had no power to depose or replace the trustees of separate schools refusing to enforce the Regulation, since the right to elect these trustees was one clearly guaranteed to the Catholic minority at the time of Confederation. But care was taken to point out that there were other legal means by which the Regulation could be made effective. To quote the precise words of the judgment:

"Their Lordships do not anticipate that the Appellants (the Separate School Trustees) will fail to obey the law now that it has been finally determined. They cannot, however, assent to the proposition that the appellant board are not liable to process if they refuse to perform their statutory obligations, or that in this respect they are in a different position from other boards or bodies of trustees entrusted with the performance of public duties which they fail or decline to perform."

It is plain that their Lordships thought that the Regulation not only should, but could be enforced.

¹⁰The only specific guarantee in regard to language is that contained in sec. 133 of the B.N.A. Act and sec. 22 of the Manitoba Act, making the French and English languages official for the Dominion and Quebec legislatures and courts.

¹¹Ottawa Separate School Trustees v. Ottawa Corporation, 1917, A.C., 76.

Finally we have the Tiny Township case¹² in which the Catholic minority in Ontario claimed the right to a greater degree of control over the courses of study in their separate schools, to a larger share in the educational grant from public funds, and to exemption from assessments for the support of continuation and high schools. Here the Canadian Supreme Court divided equally, three Protestant judges against three Catholic, so the appeal was dismissed and the decisions of the Ontario courts (which were opposed to the claims) were allowed to stand. The Privy Council confirmed the dismissal. The result is thus not conclusive of the point under discussion, but those who believe that the dissentient Catholic judges were right in their view of the law, must admit that the Privy Council showed itself no more impartial than the Supreme Court, while those who think that they were mistaken, must acquit the Protestant judges of any suspicion of prejudice.

If one turns to religious and racial question other than those relating to education there is not a great deal of evidence to be found, but such as there is would seem to confirm what has already been hinted at, namely that no additional protection has ever been secured for the minority in Canada by the appeal to the foot of the throne. In the Guibord case, an ancient *cause célèbre*, the Privy Council¹³ denied the right of the Roman Catholic ecclesiastical authorities in Quebec to prohibit the burial in consecrated ground of a member of their faith who had died while connected with a prohibited institution,¹⁴ but who had not been excommunicated or otherwise placed beyond the pale—a judgment which overruled eight out of nine Quebec judges and was so unpopular that the burial had to be carried out under the protection of a Montreal

¹²1927, S.C.R., 637. 1928, A.C., 363.

¹³L.R., 1874, Vol. VI, p. 157.

¹⁴The Institut Canadien, which professed to believe in religious toleration.

regiment. The conviction of Louis Riel in 1885 was another case which aroused considerable racial feeling: here the Privy Council affirmed the conviction and disappointed the minority by refusing leave to appeal.¹⁵ Both these cases went direct to London from provincial courts. In the Marriage Reference Case in 1912 the Privy Council and the Supreme Court¹⁶ agreed in declaring invalid a proposed Dominion statute intended to offset the *ne temere* decree by enacting that marriages performed by any authorized person should be valid throughout the Dominion regardless of the religious faith of the parties. Here the Privy Council were undoubtedly popular with the minority—but so also was the Supreme Court. In the Despatie-Tremblay case¹⁷ Quebec opinion was considerably offended when the Judicial Committee denied that certain impediments to matrimony recognized by Canon Law were part of the civil law of the province. This case again was not taken to the Supreme Court, although three of the judges of that court had pronounced in a similar sense in the Marriage Reference Case, and conceivably might have decided the matter as did the Privy Council had it come before them.

In the period under review, therefore, we find that the Privy Council on the whole has accorded slightly less recognition than has our own Supreme Court to the demands of the minority. The writer is aware of no instance where an important point affecting minority claims or aspirations has been decided more favourably to French Canada in London than at Ottawa; and the reverse is true of the Manitoba School question viewed as a whole. A minority claim appears thus to have a better chance of success before the Canadian court than before the Imperial body. Certainly there is not the slightest evidence that the appeal to the latter is a valuable safeguard,

¹⁵L.R. 10, A.C. 675.

¹⁶46 S.C.R., 132: 1912, A.C. 880.

¹⁷1927, 1 A.C. 702.

unless it be for the majority. This conclusion is perhaps scarcely surprising, if one reflects for a moment upon the nature of the problem. The problem is how to secure absolutely impartial judgments in cases involving disputes between two sections of our population divided by race into French and English, and by religion into Catholic and Protestant. Obviously an ideal Supreme Court would have to consist of honest atheists, Mohammedans, or some other indifferent race and creed. This type of court being at present unobtainable, it would seem to follow that the next best court would be one in which both opposing points of view were represented. If this is true then the Canadian Supreme Court is more likely to be unprejudiced than the Privy Council, since the former must have *at least* two members who are appointed from the bar of Quebec, and who thus speak for the minority, whereas the latter is almost certain to be entirely Protestant. By carrying a religious dispute to London an atmosphere not more favourable, but rather less favourable to impartiality, is thus secured. It is sometimes thought that the members of the Judicial Committee, by their superior training and experience, are less liable to be influenced by such personal motives. But it is difficult to believe that in this regard the English judge is any less a human being than the Canadian judge; and the type of experience required in this instance is experience in toleration, in which the Canadian judge is just as likely to have had as great a training. It is also thought that the three thousand miles of the Atlantic Ocean somehow or other lend a greater degree of impartiality to the Privy Council judgments. But this view again appears illogical, for the rivalry between Catholic and Protestant, insofar as it may exist, is by no means confined to the shores of Canada. Moreover, the very fact of distance means that the Imperial Court is less responsive to public opinion and more free from immediate contact with the dis-

approval which an unsatisfactory judgment would entail. The English and Protestant judges of the Supreme Court must be keenly aware at all times that they have a peculiarly difficult duty to perform in relation to minorities; they know that their every action will be watched, and every decision carefully scrutinized by adverse critics. Their very closeness to the scene of controversy thus compels a more cautious attitude and a more thorough deliberation.

What the Privy Council has done in our constitution is to safeguard, not minority rights, but provincial rights. An elaboration of this statement is not possible here, but it may be stated with little fear of contradiction that the Privy Council has carried its protection of provincial claims so far that to-day we have in Canada a distribution of legislative powers quite unlike that which was agreed upon at Confederation, and one which by its undue enlargement of the Provincial sphere, considerably weakens the efficient and harmonious structure of our constitution. Possibly the Judicial Committee has thought that in cutting down the Dominion powers they were assisting the minority in Canada. If so they were grievously mistaken. It is little comfort for the French-Canadian minorities in the Maritimes, in Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan to realize that the provincial governments on which they depend for their educational privileges and their civil rights have had their powers enlarged, and that the Dominion Parliament, in which the French-speaking members must always exercise a powerful influence, has been deprived of much of its former capacity. Provincial rights and minority rights would be identical if the minority were confined to the Province of Quebec. But as the French population spreads throughout the Dominion—and it is so spreading every day—it is surely to its interest to have more power concentrated at Ottawa, where it will control for many years to come a larger

degree of authority than it can in any province other than Quebec.

It is submitted that the belief in the Privy Council appeal as a safeguard for minority rights is a popular myth, devoid of any foundation in fact. If so, a principal ground for maintaining the appeal disappears.

THE SILVER FLUTE

The long shy boy caressed the silent thing,
Breathed his young breath along its silver length,
His slender fingers with translucent strength
Twinkled expectant keys. Hark! Round notes cling
And drop, clear, passionless, pure melody,
No chordal crash, no swelling overtones,
No strident brass nor dirge-like hymnal drones,
No winding, contrapuntal harmony.

But cool, white notes that fall in tonal place
And time, and make a cloister of the room.
—Slip back the centuries, shy boy, and space
Your melodies where dancing maidens grace
Green swards. You dare too far when you presume
To pipe such mode to this noise-harried race.

M. M. H.

BRITAIN AND PALESTINE

BY A. E. PRINCE

SINCE the tragic disturbances of August, 1929,¹ a violent barrage of criticism has descended upon Britain in regard to her policy in Palestine. Extremist Arab and Jewish champions have assailed her as a foil or foe to their respective nationalisms. Denouncers of all forms of "imperialism" have showered abuse. If the Shaw Commission, appointed by the British Government to enquire into the disorders, issued in the main a sympathetic report last May, the Permanent Mandates Commission of the League of Nations has this August raked the Mandatory Power fore and aft. To what extent are these criticisms justified? What has Britain done, or left undone, in the execution of her Mandate over Palestine? To what degree have her aims and aspirations in accepting the Mandate been realized? What should be her policy in the future?

At the outset, it is well to recall that the British people are animated by a unique interest in the welfare of Palestine, if only because of the intense idealism generated under Allenby in "the Last Crusade." Britishers feel a pride in liberating the "Holy Land" from thralldom to the Turk. Apologists for the "ancien régime" may argue that the pre-war political, social, economic, and religious unity of the Ottoman Empire has now given place to a wasteful diversity of several small states; that the Arab race has been dismembered into Arabian, Irakian, Syrian and Palestinian polities, separated by customs and other barriers. But Britain contends that the expulsion

¹A brief summary of the main factors in the Palestinian Problem was given by the present writer in the Autumn, 1929, issue of *QUEEN'S QUARTERLY*.

of the Turk has opened the door to these peoples for cultural, economic, religious, and political self-expression, utterly impossible under the Old Order. If the Turk had been left as Governor of Palestine, the Zionists would have waited long years to come for the establishment of a "Jewish National Home." Thanks to Britain, both Arab and Jewish nationalisms have been given their chance, if only in a negative sense, by removal of the "dead hand" of the Ottoman.

But the Mandates Commission's Report for 1930 implied that Britain had done woefully little in the way of positive achievement for the benefit of Palestine. It complained that the Mandatory Power had not been successful in executing the "two objects of the Mandate," viz., "placing the country under such political, administrative and economic conditions as will secure (1) the establishment of the Jewish National Home and (2) the development of self-governing institutions." It alleged that Britain's "inaction or partial inaction" in respect to her duties to the Palestinians, both Jewish and Arab, had been primarily responsible for the friction between these two elements of the population, which came to a head in the 1929 troubles. With regard to the establishment of the Jewish National Home, the Jews levelled charges against the Mandatory of "having hindered rather than promoted Zionist immigration" and of failure to create such essential conditions as security of life and property. The hostility of the Arabs, it was asserted, was "ultimately due to the political disappointments which they attributed . . . primarily to the British Government" (i.e. the failure to create self-governing institutions), whilst in addition the Arabs "consider the (Zionist) newcomers too numerous and receiving unduly generous treatment." The Commission further contended that Britain might have been more active in promoting co-operation between the Jews and the Arabs, especially if she had embarked upon

extensive programmes of public works, agricultural and educational development; such enterprises would have mollified the Arabs, diminished their resentment at the flood of Zionist immigration and diverted their attention from the political issue into social and economic channels.

To these strictures, the British Government made a brief but bristling reply, all the more pungent because it emanated from the Ramsay MacDonald Administration. It pointed out that the Mandate Commission, in defining the objects of the Mandate, had completely ignored the *third* obligation imposed upon Britain, that "of safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race or religion" (Article 2 of the Mandate); the interests of the non-Jews, the Arabs, were to be fostered, no less than those of the Zionists. This was "the core of the problem." Whilst the Commission admitted elsewhere the difficulty of the Mandatory's task, it did not seem to realize that this was largely due to "difficulties inherent in the Mandate" itself, on account of the "dual nature of the policy which the Government has to administer."¹ The instructions to secure a National Home for the Jews are hard to reconcile with those which prescribe safeguards for the non-Jew population, five times more numerous than the Jews. Britain indicated that the Mandates Commission in its previous reports year after year had been appreciative, sympathetic and actually enthusiastic in its appraisal of British policy in Palestine—even as late as that of 1929 issued barely a month before the disorders. The policy to which approval had been given in July, 1929, was condemned as radically wrong in August of the same year!

Has Britain really failed to carry out the obligations of the Mandatory Power to place the country under such condi-

¹To quote from the Report of the Shaw Commission.

tions as will secure the establishment of the Jewish National Home? In the first place, has she hindered rather than promoted Zionist immigration? Assuredly she has not permitted unrestricted immigration; in her declaration of policy in 1922, she laid down the principle that she would welcome as many as possible, consonant with the capacity of the country to absorb them economically. Great numbers of Jews flocked thither in the two following years, to such an extent that the Mandates Commission itself in 1924 sounded a warning concerning the wisdom of admitting large contingents. Palestine, as is well known, suffered sharp economic depression from 1925 to the middle of 1928, marked by acute unemployment and the consequent emigration of disillusioned Jews—in 1927 emigration was double immigration. In view of this slump, the Administration showed sagacity in issuing a much criticized ordinance severely restricting Zionist immigration. Nevertheless, when conditions improved in 1928, 600 immigration certificates were handed to the Jews and another 2,400 in April, 1929. It is estimated that over 100,000 Jews migrated to Palestine during the period 1919-28, although a quarter of that number later left that country. Recently Sir John Hope-Simpson (Vice-Chairman of the Greek Relief Commission for the League of Nations) has been dispatched to Palestine to make a study of the immigration and kindred problems; his report is eagerly awaited. Meantime further immigration has been temporarily suspended, an action which has roused the Zionists to vehement but unjustified protests. The importunities of the Jews for opening wide the doors for immigration cannot be acceded to lightly, without satisfactory assurances that work can be found for the newcomers and that they will not become a burden on government funds. During the 1926-7 depression, measures were taken by the Administration in the form of relief works on roads, etc., to ameliorate

the destitution of the unemployed. The Government is right in "hastening slowly" where an immigration policy is concerned. Canada and the United States will surely sympathize with such an attitude.

Has Britain failed to create those conditions of public order and security essential for the establishment of the Jewish National Home? If the acerbated hostility of Zionists and anti-Zionists be taken into consideration, the Palestine Administration must be credited with having kept law and order with a distinct success. True, there were the minor disorders of 1920-1; but down to 1929 peace was preserved, all the more remarkable if it be remembered that Syria to the north was continuously aflame with revolt, more serious even than the present troubles in Palestine and directed against detested French administrators. In the early days considerable military forces were quartered in the land, but two or three years before the disorders they had been reduced to a few armoured cars and an air squadron. After the 1921 riots a formidable British Section of the Palestine Gendarmerie had been organized, but in 1926 these Britishers were disbanded. This withdrawal of British forces from Palestine has been much criticized recently, especially by the Zionists. Britishers are now inclined to regret this error of judgment on their part. But they were misled into the belief that "complete tranquillity" had been restored in Palestine as a result of the military and political influence of the then High Commissioner, Lord Plumer. In consequence of the fervent representations of the Zionists (and their apologists in the British House of Commons in 1926) Britain was induced to believe that the Holy Land was at peace and that the Arabs were beginning to accept docilely the Balfour Declaration policy. In sanctioning the reduction of military and police forces, the Administration did not contemplate that

the Jews would throw a new bone of contention into Palestine in the shape of the Wailing Wall issue.

The complexity of the religious, legal, political, and economic issues involved in the fateful Wailing Wall question renders possible diverse interpretations of the rights and wrongs. But in respect to the lamentable episode of the Day of Atonement, 1928, it appears to the present writer that by seeking to install benches and the screen in special dispute on the pavement in front of the Wall, legally the property of the Moslems, the Jews were altering the *status quo*. The Arabs feared that if a portable screen were once permitted, it would soon be replaced by a permanent screen; a roof might be added, and a synagogue would arise on their Moslem "Holy Area." The ban of the authorities on any such synagogue furnishings had been pronounced in 1912 and 1925. The responsible Jewish authorities were therefore seriously remiss in sanctioning the introduction of the screen, and in not carrying out the orders of the British police that the screen should be removed before the next morning's service. When the police Commissioner arrived at the Wall that morning to find the screen still there, he requested the Jews themselves to carry it away; on their refusal, he felt obliged to order its forcible removal. It is most distressing that the ensuing brawl occurred at the most solemn part of the Atonement Service; the British official deserved censure for tactlessly wounding sacred susceptibilities. Yet he had sore provocation, and the Jews can be indicted for injecting religious strife into the already superheated atmosphere of political and economic dissension in Palestine. The old fear of the Moslems that their holy shrines adjoining the Wall were in danger was now revived with a bitter fanaticism; in the event of Jewish political domination, the Dome of the Rock and the Mosque Aksa, etc. (revered by association with Mahomet Himself) would be razed to the

ground to make way for a new Solomon's Temple on the former site! Apprehensive, the Moslems retaliated with actions provocative and incendiary in character. They added a stage to the Wailing Wall, the Administration feeling it ought not to interfere with Moslem Wakf (ecclesiastical) property. Next the Arabs opened a doorway in the buildings prolonging the Wall, thus converting what had been a *cul-de-sac* into a public thoroughfare leading from the Moslem Holy Area along the pavement used for Jewish worship. This was a *pied de nez* gesture of defiance to the Jews, but the government hesitated to infringe the legal rights of property-holders by prohibiting the making of the doorway. Both Jews and Arabs were thus at fault, putting the Administration in a difficult position.

It is unfortunate that at this juncture the Commission on Holy Places, recommended originally in the Mandate, was not promptly instituted. The previous justification for its non-establishment, viz., to let sleeping religious feuds lie, was no longer operative. The Mandates Commission has recently charged the Mandatory with failure in this respect; but the British Government has disclaimed sole responsibility for this error, implying that the League of Nations itself had been no less remiss in not appointing this commission. The League, moreover, has now brought such a body into being. Sir John Chancellor, the High Commissioner, had preferred the course of trying to arrive at a definition of the *status quo* with respect to the Holy Places by agreement between the two rival parties, rather than by imposing the Administration's regulations upon them. Only a month before the 1929 disorders, the Mandates Commission congratulated Chancellor "upon having done all in his power to obtain a fair and satisfactory solution of the problem." The measures approved by the Commission in July were declared in August by the same tribunal to be entirely

wrong. For indeed Chancellor trusted to the common sense of both hostile communities to refrain from chafing the sore and to allow it to cure itself. His trust was belied by Jew and Arab alike. The Zionists made the world from Jerusalem to Geneva and New York resound with their religious woes, while the Arabs were making the Wailing Wall the spear-point of militant, fanatical Islam.

This heightened tension of feeling culminated in the troubles of 1929, in which 133 Jews and 116 Arabs were killed. According to the Shaw Commission, "the immediate causes of the outbreak were, first, a long series of incidents connected with the Wailing Wall. . . These must be regarded as a whole, but the incident which in our view contributed most to the outbreak was the Jewish demonstration at the Wailing Wall on August 15. Next in importance we put the activities of the Society for the Protection of the Moslem Holy Places, and in a lesser degree of the Pro-Wailing Wall Committee; secondly, the intemperate articles which appeared in the (news) papers; thirdly, the propaganda among the less educated Arab people of a character calculated to incite them; fourthly, the enlargement of the Jewish agency; fifthly, the inadequacy of the military forces and reliable police available; sixthly, the belief, due largely to a feeling of uncertainty as to policy, that the decisions of the Palestine Government could be influenced by political considerations." All Reports agree that it was the Arabs who originated the attacks on the Jews, although later the Jews retaliated. There is, however, a sharp difference of opinion with respect to some other features of the disturbances. Thus three of the four members of the Shaw Commission practically absolved the Moslem leader, the Grand Mufti and the Palestine Arab Executive from the charge of having premeditated and organized the revolt. The fourth member, Mr. H. Snell, and the Mandates Commission seriously

implicated the Arab leaders. In reply the British Government pointed out that the disorders did not occur, as if planned by the Mufti simultaneously, in all parts of Palestine, but spread from Jerusalem during a period of days to the most outlying centres of population. Again, the Mandates Commission asserted that, although the Arab assaults were directed against the Jews, they were really aimed at Britain because of political disappointments for which they held Britain primarily responsible. The British Government retorted that the rising was a protest against the Mandate of the League of Nations rather than against His Majesty's Government, recalling the fact that virtually no attacks were launched against the local representatives of British authority.

Has Britain failed in the discharge of her obligations towards the Arabs? Assuredly she has not been able to fulfil the provision in the Mandate for the "development of self-governing institutions," because of the complications introduced by the other provisions relating to the establishment of a Jewish National Home. The Administration, therefore, has been forced to abandon the traditional British practice of fostering Parliamentary institutions (as in Irak, Egypt, and India), as no freely elected legislature sending a vast majority of non-Jew representatives, would have tolerated political Zionism. As the Jewish High Commissioner Samuel found in 1922-3, the Arabs refused to co-operate in any governmental function, such as a Legislative Council, as long as the establishment of the Jewish National Home prevailed as the cardinal principle of administrative Policy. Consequently, although Palestine is an "A" type of Mandate, containing a people which has "reached a stage of development where their existence as independent nations can be provisionally recognized," she has had to be treated and governed as a "B" Man-

date such as is exercised over uncivilized natives or as a colonial dependency. The Palestinian Government, nevertheless, has given considerable encouragement to the growth of local self-government by the bestowal of autonomous powers upon community and municipal councils.

To the indictment of the Mandates Commission that the Mandatory had been negligent in its promotion of the interests of the Arabs in social, educational and economic spheres, and that a more active policy of public works, etc., would have brought Jews and Arabs into closer and more friendly association, the British Government has replied that, although the Commission had been making investigations, hearing evidence and stating conclusions year after year, this Report of 1930 was the first in which such charges had been levelled or even foreshadowed. Britain further expressed grave doubts concerning the possibility of pacifying the Arabs by such projects of social and economic amelioration "on account of the paramount importance hitherto attached by the Arab leaders to the *political* issue." In the third place, the Mandatory Power enumerated briefly a few of her main achievements in Palestine. The present writer proposes to elaborate upon this bare recital of facts in the official document.

Not the least of the benefits conferred upon Palestine by Britain has been that of a clean, wholesome government, freed from the former Turkish corruption. Nowadays much is heard of the wonderful achievements of the Jewish pioneers, and all lovers of Palestine will pay the warmest meed of praise to their efforts. But it should not be forgotten that it was British administrators who blazed many of the trails, and later co-operated with the Zionists in clearing away the dense undergrowth of disease, ignorance and misery. The Jewish apologists who claim for themselves the credit of combating the scourges of malaria, trachoma, etc., seldom mention that the

British Military Administration in the early years of 1918-20 had inaugurated campaigns against these pests, and that the Civil administration since 1920 has furthered these public health projects. In the agricultural domain, British administrators have given most attention to the needs of the Arabs, as the Jews have been able to provide for themselves out of their ample funds and Occidental technical experience. Advice concerning modern methods of production and the use of agricultural implements has been tendered to those Arab farmers who have been employing seventh century ploughs and mediaeval processes; loans in cash have been made, and seeds and grain provided. Afforestation has done much to recover the loss involved in the serious denudation of trees during the Turk régime. The Arabs have proved apt pupils in this sphere; in the past few years they have planted over a million of olive trees alone. The Administration appreciates the magnificent work of the Jewish colonists, but it has refused to dispossess the Arabs in the Beisan district, for example, as demanded by the Zionists. True, some of the Arabs could not produce a legal title to the lands they occupy, because of the lax methods of the Turkish government. In doubtful cases the British Administration has acted upon the assumption that these Arabs had a moral title to ownership. It is executing an elaborate cadastral survey with the object of a definitive registration of land titles. Ordinances have been issued lessening the burden of taxation upon the Jewish settlers and others who are actively engaged in tillage. Measures have been taken for the prevention of disease among cattle and of loss from locust plagues.

Because the Jews and most of the Christian denominations prefer their own "separate" schools and other institutions of learning, most of the educational grants-in-aid have been devoted to the government schools, chiefly attended by Moslem

Arabs. In 1928, nevertheless, the contribution to the Hebrew educational budget was substantially increased. Criticism has been levelled at the Administration for allowing instruction to be carried on in Arabic, rather than in English, in the primary schools. This policy can, however, be defended on the grounds that in dealing with a large illiterate population it is better to lead them into the paths of culture by gentle stages through the medium of their own vernacular than to give them a smattering of English. It is to the credit of the Mandatory power that it has prevented the forcible imposition of its own language upon the mandatees. In the higher grade schools English is a voluntary subject.

Much has been done by the Administration in the way of the improvement and construction of roads and other public works benefiting Jew and Arab alike. The drainage of swamps has been prosecuted by the Mandatory Power as well as by the Zionists; Rutenberg's hydro-electric schemes for harnessing the power from the River Jordan have been approved and encouraged, as also the Tulloch-Novomeysky project for the recovery of the Dead Sea minerals, especially the rich potash salts. Minor improvements have been effected in Jaffa harbour, whilst the extensive programme for making Haifa one of the finest ports in the Orient is being put into execution by the Administration.

The Mandatory Power is forbidden to interfere with religious liberty. Britain has fulfilled this obligation in the letter and spirit. In the light of the 1928-9 disorders, the question may even be raised whether she has not been too tolerant, too deferential towards religious susceptibilities. Loans have been extended to the distressed Greek Orthodox Church; the Religious Communities Ordinance bestowed a cultural and religious autonomy upon the various communities in the State. An adequate judicial system has been created,

protecting the rights of natives and foreigners as enjoined by the Mandate. The old Ottoman procedure has been largely superseded, and improvements have been introduced from time to time, as, for instance, when the expedient of the unpaid magistracy was found to be unworkable, it was replaced by a professional stipendiary magistracy.

What were the motives which prompted Britain to accept the Mandate in Palestine? To what extent have her hopes and aspirations been realized in the past, and in the light of her best interests what should be her policy in the future? In one of the most recent and best brief studies of the Palestinian Problem,¹ it is asserted that "Great Britain's assumption of responsibility in Palestine and its support of the Jewish National Home project are partly matters of prestige and partly motivated by a desire for economic advantage. More important than either of these considerations, however, is the necessity, from a British viewpoint, of controlling the most direct lines of communication with India and the East." This catalogue of British aims should, nevertheless, have included a reference to the idealistic motive of trusteeship for both oppressed and backward peoples, for Jews and Arabs. There may be much cant and hypocrisy in discussions of imperial moral responsibilities; but history, it can be confidently asserted, will record that many of the finer spirits amongst the administrators, statesmen and citizens of Britain (as also of France, Holland, the United States and other bearers of "the white man's burden") have been, and still are, stirred in thought and deed by a passionate sense of helping less fortunate or less advanced races to help themselves. This impulse inspired in part the policy of Britain in fostering the idea of a national home for the Jews in Palestine; liberal opinion as

¹*The Palestine Conflict*, by Miss Elizabeth MacCallum, Foreign Policy Association, Vol. V, No. 16.

voiced in the utterances of great social reformers like Shaftesbury, literary geniuses like Sir Walter Scott and Robert Browning, cultured statesmen like Balfour, soldiers like Allenby or administrators such as Sir Wyndham Deedes has reacted against the wave of Anti-Semitism to sympathize with the Jewish national aspirations. Not a few Britishers commenced their duties in helping in the post-war administration of Palestine animated by a fervent enthusiasm for Zionist ideals—although a knowledge of the factors involved in the problem of the Holy Land acquired by living in Palestine may have modified that enthusiasm for Zionism in its extremist implications. From the standpoint of British trusteeship, as between the Jew and Arab, whose need is the greater? Is it the Jew with his modern technique and his world-wide financial and moral backing (recently strengthened by the creation of the enlarged Jewish Agency)? The Jew in Palestine is neither backward nor oppressed. But the Arab is certainly backward, whilst he feels himself oppressed under the shadow of political Zionism; he fears total eclipse in his own land as a consequence of political domination by the Jewish numerical minority or even, in the years to come, by a Jewish majority, should such a majority be created by the migration of a million Jews to Palestine. The Arab needs British help much more than the robust Jew. The Arab can learn, and is learning, from the splendid cultural and economic example of the Jew in Palestine; but it remains a consecrated trust for Britain to help guide the Arab out of his primitive modes of agriculture, his mediaeval educational methods, his Ottoman political practices into the modern highways of progress and enlightenment.

Has Palestine been a sphere of "economic advantage" and exploitation for Britain? So far, at least, the Palestine venture has been costly for the seriously embarrassed British

taxpayer. The military conquest and the military administration of Palestine exacted a toll of thousands of lives and millions of pounds. It is impossible to determine exactly the financial burdens incurred by the Imperial Treasury since the Mandate was assigned to Britain in 1920. But, as the British Government informed the Mandates Commission: "Taking only the period since 1921, when the present system of administration (i.e. control by the Secretary of State for the Colonies) was inaugurated, the sums provided by H. M. Government have amounted to more than £9,000,000 sterling. This expenditure naturally included the cost of defence of the country." Thus the British Treasury made "non-recoverable" grants-in-aid of nearly a million pounds for the special British Section of the Palestine Gendarmerie, which was not disbanded till March, 1926. Moreover, by the Palestine and East Africa Loans Act of December, 1926, the British Government guaranteed a loan for Palestine of £4,500,000 at the favourable 5% interest. In 1928 more than £600,000 was paid over to the Ottoman Public Debt; obligations to foreign bondholders must be given the priority over those of the milch-cow, the poor British public! Although Palestine just before the 1929 disorders was beginning to balance her budget and becoming less of a drain upon Imperial resources, the British taxpayer is fearful lest he be involved in heavy financial obligations for the future on account of that country. Additional expenditure has been incurred during the recent troubles by the despatch of soldiers, warships, aircraft carriers, etc., and the necessity of keeping a much larger garrison there. A certain measure of compensation has been paid to those who suffered grave damage. These events, undoubtedly, have opened British eyes to the stern realities of the Palestine problem. The Arabs will never be reconciled to Jewish nationalism, and if coerced will look for aid to Ibn Saoud, the

powerful king of the Nejd and other parts of Arabia. Britain may become involved in a desperate war with that potentate which would seriously jeopardize the present British policy of peace, retrenchment and reform; the Titanic load of taxation would be increased. Even if an Arab war does not materialize, there is danger of new financial commitments if the "Forward" Jabotinsky Jewish policy is adopted; should crowds of Jews pour into Palestine, it will probably be found, as was the case in 1926-7, that the country is not able to absorb them; serious unemployment will again ensue on a much larger scale, and the relief contributions may prove too heavy for the Palestinian treasury, necessitating further subsidies from the Imperial Exchequer. And now the Mandates Commission clamours for a "more active policy" and more extensive programmes of public works, educational and economic development. During the period July 1920 to December 1928 the total revenues of the Administration amounted only to £18,733,433. No very ambitious projects can be undertaken by a government with a meagre annual budget of some £2,250,000, and in the near future there are no prospects of considerable additions to the revenues. The Imperial Treasury would undoubtedly have to shoulder heavy financial commitments. It is easy for the Mandates Commission to make such a suggestion, but its practical application would be difficult for Britain, already strained to the utmost of her resources. The possession of the Palestine Mandate has brought little grist to the mill of the hard-hit British trade and industry. During 1928 only 11.6% of the total imports into Palestine came from Britain, although some of the imports from Egypt were also English goods in transit; even Germany supplied nearly 10% and the United States 6%. Britain, nevertheless, helped Palestine by taking 36% of her exports; Germany received less than 5%, and the United States 2%. Veritably Britain has

not grown bloatedly rich by her so-called "exploitation" of Palestine.

It is possible, moreover, that the strategic significance of Palestine as a bastion guarding on the east the main artery of the Empire, the Suez Canal, on the road to India, has been somewhat overrated. If British troops are concentrated in the Canal Zone, as is contemplated in recent Egyptian arrangements, will they not suffice for the purpose of protection? It is not as though Palestine were planted right against the Suez Canal. The Canal is buttressed by one of the most formidable of all strategic barriers, a hundred miles and more of comparatively waterless, inhospitable desert, served by a single railway which could be easily torn up in case danger threatened from that quarter. This desert of Sinai is not of course an invulnerable obstacle, especially in these days of long-ranging aeroplane attack. Yet even our possession of Palestine itself does not ensure against such a menacing assault on the Canal from, say, Arabia or Syria. It is at least a debatable proposition whether the military advantages of a defensive line pushed out towards the northern and eastern frontiers of Palestine are greatly superior to one far south of Palestine but at some distance from the Canal with wide wastes of Sinai in front to offer protection. Britain is realizing, moreover, that a policy of indefinite imperial territorial expansion, of advancing political frontiers farther and farther in the supposed interests of security and of the safeguarding of existing possessions is, at the present stage of history, injudicious from the standpoint of international peace, and unsound if viewed from the angle of the best imperial interests. Consolidation and conciliation rather than conquest should be henceforth the fundamentals of British policy. Many signs are pointing to the fact that the wisest British statesmen are stressing this policy of conciliation, especially through the

channels of granting larger and larger measures of self-government. Such is the case in Iraq, Egypt and India, where, it may be presumed, the British stake will be gradually reduced. If so there will be less cause to be uneasy about political control of communications with that country. Many are inclining to the view that what has been perhaps the cardinal principle of British imperial policy, namely, the safeguarding of the route to India, will not assume in the days to come the prominence it has had in the past!

Whom is Britain to conciliate in Palestine? Is she to adopt the extremist Zionist interpretation of affairs, which will almost inevitably necessitate a course of "blood and iron" coercion at the expense of the Arab majority of the population? At a time of grave crisis in India, are we to favour a policy in Palestine which sorely offends Mohammedan susceptibilities everywhere; a policy which already is having serious reverberations amongst the seventy millions or more of Moslem subjects in India? Assuming that the Jews are encouraged to dominate Palestine politically, will that ensure a Jewish State warmly devoted to Britain? It is extremely doubtful. Colonel Wedgwood and others have been advocating Forward Zionist claims on the basis of a vision of a Jewish Palestine forming the "Seventh Dominion" in the British Commonwealth. It is difficult for the present writer to visualize the masses of Eastern European immigrant Jews, financed largely by American money, entering the British Commonwealth and working in harmony; they would be much more likely, if dominant, to demand and exercise speedily "the right of secession." An attitude of conciliation towards both Arab and Jew is of paramount importance. Britain has undertaken a solemn international obligation in the Mandate for Palestine; she cannot and will not abandon that Mandate at the present critical juncture, but she must fix definitely her interpretation.

She should make it clear that she does not intend by her pledged encouragement of "the Jewish National Home" to foster the idea of the *political* domination of the Jews, the establishment of a Jewish State "as Jewish as England is English." She should make it clear, however, that she favours the establishment in Palestine of a Jewish National Home in its cultural, spiritual and economic aspects. With regard to immediate policy only the sketchiest outline can be indicated. It is suggested that the obligation in the Mandate to secure "the development of self-governing institutions" should be put in effect straightway. Let a representative Parliament be summoned; electoral qualifications such as the literacy test might be devised to eliminate the nomadic Bedouin Arab population. Undoubtedly the Moslem-Christian representatives would at the present time outnumber the Jews and in the current heated atmosphere would tend to pass measures detrimental to the Zionists in such matters as immigration and land purchase. But the right of veto should be reserved for the British High Commissioner who would prevent the enactment of measures which might prove harmful to Palestine as a whole. Possibly there would be deadlocks at the outset, but after the lapse of time the rivals would probably come to work together in the common assembly and instead of two solid blocs, Jew and non-Jew, new lines of division would appear in new parties or groups. Such a constitutional experiment has, of course, possibilities of failure, but at all events it is worth trying. A Parliament may save Palestine. No longer an Armageddon, Palestine may become truly "the Holy Land," where the Judah lion will lie down with the Arab lamb—and no Mandatory will be needed to lead them!

TRAVELLING WITH THE SIMCOES

BY FRANK YEIGH

BOTH John Graves Simcoe and Mrs. Simcoe were great travellers in a day when the means of transport were radically different from those which now prevail. As a soldier and administrator, Colonel Simcoe lived up to the traditions of both services by journeying near and far as duty necessitated, never objecting or complaining, however onerous the conditions. Mrs. Simcoe must have been an admirable travel companion, showing equal courage and adaptability in meeting the ever-changing conditions, and rendering an additional service to posterity by her racy and illuminating diary. It is difficult to realize the primitive conditions of travel of a century or more ago, both on land and sea. Steam transportation has come into existence since the eighteenth century, and there is as great a difference between the sailing craft of 1792 and the modern transatlantic liner as there is between an old-fashioned carriage and the latest type of motor car.

The voyage to Quebec of the newly appointed Lieutenant-Governor and Mrs. Simcoe is vividly described in the chatty diary, and forms an interesting commentary upon the ocean travel of that day, for long was the voyage (forty-six days) and great the discomfort upon the *Triton*. A few extracts from the feminine record are illuminating.

“I became giddy as soon as I entered the ship and went to my cabin, an apartment just large enough to swing a cot. One of the port-hole windows was stove in and the gentlemen at dinner were quite wet. Dishes are often tossed to every corner of the room. Heat so

excessive (near the Azores) I could not sleep. Very hard gale this morning. The sea ran mountains high. I was obliged on deck to hold fast by a cannon. I viewed the tempestuous scene with astonishment. This abode in a storm is certainly horrid beyond the imagination of those who have not experienced it. The noises on board a ship almost deprive one of one's senses; every place wet and dirty, besides being bruised by sudden motions of the ship and half-drowned by leaks in the cabin. The evening proved so rough and dismal that everybody sat melancholy and unoccupied. My cot striking against the side of the cabin most uncomfortably, Col. Simcoe hung up feather beds to receive the blows. This is a good sea-boat but so leaky in her upper works that the floor of my cabin is scarcely ever dry."

Besides being blown far out of her course near the Azores. the *Triton* sailed perilously near Sable Island on her northward way, passed what is now Sydney Harbor on the left, and the Magdalen Islands on the right. During the passage of the Gulf they ran into a dreadful gale and snowstorm in which several of the sailors were frost-bitten. Looking out of her cabin window after they reached Quebec Mrs. Simcoe saw the town covered with snow in an all-day rain.

"I was not disposed to leave the ship to enter so dismal a looking town as Quebec appeared through the mist, sleet and rain, but a carriole carried the party to the Inn in the Upper Town to which we ascended by an immensely steep hill through streets ill built. I was terribly shaken and formed a very unpleasant idea of the town which I had come to and the dismal appearance of the old-fashioned Inn I arrived at."

During their stay in Quebec Mrs. Simcoe found the life not unduly dull. A visit was made to Madame Baby's; thermometer ten degrees below.

"I preferred coming home in the open carriage," which is described as "large and pleasant, with a seat in front for children. The drivers are Canadian and, therefore, will not wear liveries. The Canadian coats, with capots and sashes, look very picturesque. Then a ball. The ladies much dressed; Miss Williams the most so. Lord Dorchester sends his dormeuse for Mrs. Simcoe, who is drinking tea with Miss Mountain. It is a travelling carriage adapted for sleeping that I might see whether I should like that sort of a carriage to travel in in Upper Canada. It is like an open carriage, with a head made of sealskin and lined with baize; a large bear or buffalo skin fixed in front, which perfectly secures you from wind and weather. There is a feather bed to keep one's feet warm. I like it very much and bespoke one to be made the same."

They remained at Quebec until June of 1792. Early that month Simcoe left for Montreal on his first journey to Upper Canada. Halting at Kingston he commenced the organization of his Government with the first meeting of the Executive Council. He refers to the St. Lawrence as "most august of rivers." One wonders if Simcoe, approaching Kingston with his little suite and force, recalled a somewhat similar scene a hundred and eight years before when the St. Lawrence and the embryo city witnessed a procession of notables. On the wooded shore stood a band of Iroquois chiefs, dressed no doubt for the occasion, to greet the French Governor, La Barre, who made an imposing approach with over a hundred canoes, four groups abreast in military formation, followed by flat boats gaily painted and armed with cannon and manned by a force of 400 men. Finally came the French leader himself, surrounded by an armed guard and with a brigade of canoes as a rear guard. On the following morning La Barre, with his force under arms and a double file of soldiers encircling his official tent, met the sixty chiefs of the Iroquois. With their

genius for parade, the French Governor and his staff wore all the brilliant uniforms possible.

We may travel in imagination with Simcoe on one of his overland trips from Niagara to Detroit, in 1793, which was typical of many others, not only through that section of country, but through other parts of the new province. One wonders that the journey was made in the late winter months of February and March, when travelling conditions would be at their worst. It is easy to visualize the daily events from the journal written by Major E. B. Littlehales. The little party, including the chief and his staff, left Niagara in sleighs though many other methods of transportation were to be used before their return several weeks later. At the outset the roads were indifferent and wet, and the first day of travel brought them only to the 20 mile creek where they slept in one of Colonel Butler's houses.

Forty Mile Creek (the site of the present Grimsby) was reached the next day when two Missisauga Indians suddenly appeared as the postmen of the day, carrying an important Express for the Governor that needed a day to answer. Then the party, resuming its westward way, passed by the site of Hamilton on the route of that period to the Grand River and Captain Brant's Mohawk village and travelled on the ice of the river with great rapidity for a considerable distance.

The red men at once hoisted their flags and trophies of war, firing a *feu de joie* in compliment to His Excellency, "the representative of the King, their Father." What a vivid scene it must have been! Here the travellers found a well-built church of wood with a steeple (still standing as the oldest Protestant Church in the Province), a school house and an excellent house belonging to Capt. Brant. "We heard Divine Service performed by an Indian. The devout behaviour of the women, the melody of their voices and the excellent time they

kept in singing hymns is worthy of observation," recorded the observant chronicler.

Proceeding through what is the present township of Burford, and using the Brant ferry that later gave its name to the city of Brantford, they found the fine open plains frequented by immense herds of deer. The dexterity and alacrity of the Mohawks, now in the party, in making a wigwam struck the pale-faces with admiration. The builders cut down large trees with their tomahawks, barked them and in a few minutes constructed most comfortable huts covered with the elm bark and made capable of resisting any inclemency of weather.

A man almost starved was encountered on the lonely trail and was overjoyed to obtain some biscuit and pork but proved later to be a thief escaping from justice. The party crossed a small branch of the La Tranche (the Thames) on a tree trunk in this bridgeless age and, camping at night, much fatigued, was refreshed with soup and dried venison. Soon afterwards they met two red messengers—a Wyandotte and a Chippewa—carrying Government messages to Niagara. Spying a raccoon in a tree, the red guides of the Simcoe party gave a tremendous shout and all set to work with their tomahawks and axes. In ten or fifteen minutes the tree was cut down and the animal captured. "It made an excellent supper."

Other interesting glimpses of the Indians are given on many a page of this old-time journal—of stake fences used by them as runways in deer hunting, of Indian burying-grounds where the graves were covered with wicker and marked by a large pole carrying painted hieroglyphics denoting the nation, tribe and achievements of the deceased—apparently a type of totem pole now entirely gone from Old Ontario.

Blazed trees with carved figures of Indians returning from battle with scalps and animals were frequent. A breakfast of eggs and venison was given the travellers at the Delaware Indian village where an all-day council of the Six Nations was held. In a Chippewa wigwam the squaws were making maple sugar, and corn fields showed a progressive state of civilization. While at the Moravian mission village among the Delawares, a member of the Simcoe party missed his watch, being certain that it was left at the last encampment. Two Indians at once offered to return for it, and brought it back after a night tramp of 26 miles. Coming to another branch of the La Tranche, the Governor was agreeably surprised to meet a score of carriages to carry the party on their way. They passed the remains of a deserted Chippewa village where a battle with the Senecas had taken place and where human bones in abundance marked the site of the ancient sanguinary struggle. When the shore of the Detroit River was reached, the Canadian militia fired a salute; the party crossed the stream amid much floating ice and entered Detroit, where the garrison, which was under arms to receive His Excellency, fired a Royal salute. He reviewed the 24th regiment and then proceeded by carriage to the river Rouge to inspect a newly-built vessel. "Saw the bridge where Pontiac, the Indian chief, after his treacherous attempt to surprise Detroit, made a stand. So great was the slaughter of British troops that it is called the Bloody Bridge."

On February 23rd they began the return trip and at the end of the first day had covered forty miles and had reached the point where the carriages were left. Here each took his pack and walked to the Moravian village where Divine Service was held. The Indians presented the party with venison and then executed a ceremonial dance which always forms part of the programme when any of the King's officers of rank

visit them. "As usual we sang God Save the King and went to rest."

The next day the "King's officers" saw in the snow tracks of deer, wolves, bears, otters and other animals. They soon reached the La Tranche and spent a day in studying a possible location for the provincial capital,—then not finally determined. It was thought to be

"eminently calculated for the metropolis of all Canada. Among many other essentials it possesses the advantages of a command of territory, internal situation, facility of water communication, superior navigation for boats to near its source. The soil is luxuriously fertile and the land capable of being easily cleared and soon put in a state of agriculture. A pinery carries timber well calculated for the erection of public buildings; climate not inferior to any part of Canada."

But nothing further came of the examination and favorable report, and thus London missed being the capital of Upper Canada.

Resuming the homeward journey, the party was treated to a roasted porcupine which tasted like a young pig. The Newfoundland dog accompanying the party bit the animal and soon its mouth was filled with quills which the Indians easily extracted and applied a root that speedily healed the wounds. "Slept on hemlock in our wigwam; rained all night. Were agreeably surprised to meet Capt. Brant the next day with a numerous retinue. Much amused by seeing Brant chase a mink, which he did not kill." The Simcoes were soon at the Mohawk village again; the Indians arranged a dance and most of His Excellency's staff, equipped and dressed in imitation of Indians, were adopted as Chiefs. A snow storm delayed the party on the stretch from the Grand River to Burlington Bay. Two days later the round trip of several hundred miles ended at Niagara and Navy Hall.

Simcoe travelled extensively throughout his provincial domain with the object of planning roads, essential to the settlement of the new country. He soon realized the advantages of a highway connecting Lake Ontario at York with Lake Huron at Georgian Bay. His efforts finally resulted in the construction of one of the longest streets in the world, similar to that linking New York and Albany along the Hudson River. The Yonge Street of to-day extends, under various names, for thirty miles, taking the modern traveller through one of the fairest parts of Ontario, with fertile fields stretching to the east and west reminiscent of an English landscape. When the route was finally determined, the Governor directed that the road should be built largely by his miniature military force, the faithful Queen's Rangers, who thereby rendered a most valuable pioneer service. Many old prints are extant depicting the hardy and sturdy soldiers dropping gun and bayonet for pick and shovel to become roadmakers, artificers and tree cutters. The road when completed proved its usefulness as the main artery of the settlement that stretched northward from York. Simcoe named the thoroughfare after Sir George Yonge, a fellow-Devonian, who was Secretary of War in the British Government of 1791. The records of the various trips made by the Lieutenant-Governor and his party through this section of Upper Canada reveal the hardships involved and the intrepid spirit of the leader and his retinue.

Various routes were tested between York and the waters of Georgian Bay (then called Lake Huron only) before the location of Yonge Street was finally decided, and that involved exploratory journeys of a pioneer character. Such a one was that undertaken by Simcoe and his party in 1793 from Humber Bay to Matchedash Bay, and recorded by Alexander Macdonnell, sheriff of the Home District.

A batteau set out from York with Simcoe, Lieut.

Pilkington as surveyor, Lieut. Darling of the 5th Regiment, Lieut. Givens of the Queen's Rangers, A. Aitken, a deputy surveyor, and four Indians. The first stop was made at the Humber, near what is now Baby's Point. An early start the next morning was made and at noon "took the bones out of the pork to make the loads lighter." For supper the party found some wild grapes and crawfish. Proceeding northward they passed through excellent land for grain or grass (the flourishing York county farms of to-day) with uncommonly large trees, mostly pine. An occasional Indian trader was passed on the way.

Leaving the Humber River, they used a stage for the next section of the journey and transferred later to five canoes which had to be dragged through marshy quagmires. Soon after making the evening fires, Indians brought Simcoe a pair of ducks, some beaver's meat and a beaver's tail—three toothsome tidbits, to which His Excellency responded with a gift of rum and tobacco. Entering Lake Simcoe, a band of red men fired a salute; "they were all more or less drunk and made rather an unintelligible speech," states the honest chronicle. Passing through the Narrows at Atherly, the party heard the death hallow of a solitary Indian in a canoe—a mode of telling the travellers that death had smitten his camp. "The end of the world is at hand; Indians would be no more," was the refrain of his chant. The scenery of the Severn, around the Ragged Rapids and falls of the present, struck the visitors as "pleasing and romantik" as it still is, but with a much greater volume of water, no doubt, then than now. The presentation of a keg of rum to the assembled Indians, while evidently customary, left the partakers "without the use of their limbs or their reason."

The squaws belonging to the camp of the sick and dead red men visited the Governor, some carrying the images of

their deceased husbands in the shape of dolls decorated with silver broaches, paint and feathers. One effigy bore around its neck a medal that had been given the dead chief. Simcoe rewarded them with knives and looking glasses, whereupon a chief spread a beaver blanket under Simcoe and in an oration said: "You white men pray; we poor Indians do not know what it is, but we hope you will entreat the Great Spirit to remove the sickness from amongst us." By presenting the blanket they had "made their Father's bed."

Resuming their homeward way, Simcoe and some of his party covered the last thirty miles over the part of Yonge Street north of York already decided upon, while the others returned by the west branch of the Holland River. "Vincall and I (Sheriff Macdonnell) remained behind to pound and boil Indian corn for our breakfast." Birch bark was secured for torches to be used when spearing fish. As food was running low they made an exchange with a party of Indians of powder, shot and a looking glass for eight pair of ducks, some of which were broiled for supper. "We crept under the canoe and in rain and wind passed a very uncomfortable night." It was difficult to launch the canoe in the morning as the water had frozen hard during the night. The final entry reads: "Though it rained all the night before, set out at daylight. At 12 o'clock halted at the creek where we met the trader's tent on the way up, and breakfasted. Slept at St. Johns (near Baby's Point on the Humber) and arrived at York the next day at ten o'clock, having been absent 27 days."

Simcoe's excursions into the surrounding wilderness became more frequent as the foundation-laying days passed. He often made his way to Niagara Falls and covered the country along the upper Niagara. These were all walking outings such as an English pedestrian would enjoy. But a walk to Burlington Bay and the Head of the Lake, involving a tramp through many miles of practically unsettled territory on poor

roads or trails must have been more than a passing matter of physical exercise. One wonders how many middle-aged men of the present generation, in this non-walking and all-riding age, would endure such a test. Simcoe probably thought nothing, however, of the walk from his Castle Frank home overlooking the Don down to the water front and the official buildings in the primitive capital.

The Chief Executive of necessity travelled frequently from Niagara to York, especially with a view to studying that location as a possible site for the provincial capital as his mind gradually abandoned the position on the La Tranche, or Thames River. Accompanied by several military gentlemen of his staff, Simcoe set out by boat from Navy Hall on the second of May, 1793, for York and followed the shores of Lake Ontario. One of the party, Bouchette, the surveyor, has left a record of his first sight of the proposed capital.

“It fell to my lot to make the first survey of York Harbour; the Lieutenant-Governor having formed extensive plans for the improvement of the colony had resolved upon laying the foundations of a provincial capital. I still distinctly recollect the untamed aspect which the country exhibited when first I entered the beautiful basin. Dense and trackless forests lined the margin of the lake and reflected their inverted images on its glossy surface. The wandering savage had erected his ephemeral habitation beneath their luxuriant foliage; the group then consisted of two families of Mississagas (the tribe which sold the site of Toronto for the value of eighty dollars!) and the bay and neighbouring marshes were the hitherto uninvaded haunts of immense coveys of wild fowl, indeed they were so abundant as in some measure to annoy us during the night.”

During July of the same year Simcoe took the preliminary steps for removing the seat of government from Niagara to York. Two companies of the Queen's Rangers sailed from Queenston to the new site, and, later in the month, Simcoe left

Navy Hall on His Majesty's schooner the *Misisaga*, accompanied by the remainder of the Queen's Rangers. Thus a government with its military force crossed the Lake to the new site, a trip then taking several hours compared with the two now required by a modern steamer. Here the King's representative lived during the balance of the summer and part of the winter in a canvass house, once the property of Captain Cook.

Scarce a settlement in the new province but was visited by the Simcoes. Frequently they were obliged to endure the discomforts and risks of travel in winter. The homes of the more substantial settlers frequently proved veritable havens for the weary and exhausted travellers. Mrs. Simcoe's diary preserves the record of a winter journey along the St. Lawrence and westward to Niagara. At Johnstone (near Prescott) the travellers were comfortable in Major Littlehales' house, with a promise of turkeys and venison every day, and rooms with stoves in them. On the way to Kingston a heavy snowfall made it necessary to beat the way with a lighter carriage on the coldest day remembered in Upper Canada. Four miles were covered on the ice (beyond Gananoque), driving as fast as possible as that was thought the safest way on rotten ice. Mrs. Simcoe was naturally very much frightened. A team of horses had been lost a few days before, "choke ropes" proving unavailing in the attempt to rescue them.

Kingston at last, on the first of March, where they were comfortably lodged in the barracks on the site of the present Tête de Pont barracks, though the drawing room lacked a stove. So westward to Hay Bay on the delightful ice, and on to Mr. Cartwright's house—a romantic spot on the Appanee (Napanee River). On the Bay of Quinte they travelled on a coat of upper ice with two feet of water between that and the original ice, owing to a rapid thaw. The *Onondaga* reaching York, off Gibraltar Point, they were apparently in

great danger with the wind blowing extremely hard from the shore. The Captain chose to turn the Point without shifting a sail, (he was supposed to be not sober!) ; at the request of the Governor the English Lieutenant gave orders that the boat be brought safely into the harbour. A more pleasant entry covers the rest of the trip to Navy Hall, sailing in a canoe. "I was delighted with it," chronicles the diarist, "the motion so easy, so pleasant, so quiet, like what I should suppose being in a palanquin. We sat on cushions in the bottom of the canoe."

But there came, with the inevitability of time, the last travels and the last days in Upper Canada. In 1796 Simcoe's long-sought application for leave to visit England was granted and he was notified that the *Pearl*, sailing on August 10, would carry him from Quebec. On July 20 with his family he took leave forever of Castle Frank and on the next day sailed on the *Onondaga*, which reached Kingston after two days. Once more he sailed the St. Lawrence by batteaux, amid scenes that had become familiar since the first trip westward in 1792. Three days were necessary to cover the distance between Montreal and Quebec, whence he sailed on September 11. He landed at Deal on October 13—a voyage of over a month. Coaches carried the party to Dover and Canterbury, thence to London, and finally to Exeter and Wolford Lodge. Home again was the ambassador of the Motherland to her newest province; home again, but expecting confidently to return to his colonial charge.

But the fates had determined otherwise. San Domingo was to be his next station where he remained a few months only because of ill health. While on an official voyage to Lisbon in the summer of 1806 he was taken seriously ill and was hurried back to England. He died at Exeter on October 26, and was buried by torchlight in the chapel at Wolford Lodge.

TAYVILLE

SKETCHES OF AN ONTARIO TOWN IN THE 'NINETIES

BY J. K. ROBERTSON

I. TAYVILLE STATION

TO all outward appearances, Tayville station in the year of our Lord 1930 is exactly the same as it was in 1895. Built of the beautiful reddish limestone for which the town is noted, it gives an impression of enduring solidity in the midst of the changing scenes about it. Three taxi-cabs, it is true, have replaced the hotel horse-buses which in the 'nineties never failed to meet all trains, and Peter Doran's son, who has sold his horse and cart, is now pleased to transfer your baggage, at fifty cents a piece, on a small motor truck. But the long, low, stone building stands like a kind of Gibraltar unaffected by the flux of events around it. So at least it seemed to me the other day when I stopped off the International Limited to pay a flying visit to my native town. This impression was strengthened by the sight of Mike Sullivan, the baggageman of my boyhood days, who, in spite of snow-white hair, was still in active service.

"Halloa, Mike," said I. "You and this station look exactly the same as you did thirty years ago."

"Well, I may look the same, Jimmie," replied Mike, shaking hands with me, "but I want to tell you I feel a darn side older. And as for the station, it's a good guess that it thinks there is something wrong with this old world. To tell the truth, Jimmie, this place ain't what it used to be."

"Yes," said I, "with so much transportation by car and bus and truck, the railways must be hard hit."

"That's not what I mean," explained Mike. "As a matter of fact the annual returns for Tayville are nearly double what

they were ten years ago. It's not that, but I don't know as I can explain. Do you mind the time in 1897 when Lord Aberdeen came to open the fair?"

"Sure, I do, we got a day's holiday from school on the strength of his visit."

"Well," said Mike, "perhaps you remember that he came from Ottawa in a special train; that the band and all you school kids, in fact half the town, met him at the station; that the local company of the Forty-second Battalion formed a guard of honour on this very platform, and escorted him to the fair grounds."

"Yes, I remember that, too, for a bunch of those same kids nearly got run over by a frightened horse."

"All right," replied Mike. "Now let me tell you something else. Last year Lord and Lady Willingdon came to open the new War Memorial Hospital. There was no special train, and no parade, for they motored from Ottawa, and never came near this place. Now do you see what I mean?"

In Tayville, as in all other towns, the changes brought about by the internal combustion engine, for the most part, are taken as a matter of course. A new service garage soon ceases to be the subject of comment, and the old landmark which has been removed quickly takes its place among the shadowy pictures of bygone days. But Mike Sullivan had put his finger on a more subtle change. Tayville station, in spite of increased railway traffic, had ceased to be the one and only centre of all those activities which linked the town with an outside world and which so often fired the imagination of its growing youth. I recalled the many times in boyhood days when I had stood on this same platform dreaming golden dreams as I watched the end of a receding observation coach.

During the next twenty-four hours I found my mind constantly going back to Victorian days, and to those scenes in which the station was always the solid background. Indeed,

sleep did not come readily that night, for, with photographic detail, picture after picture flashed on that invisible screen which in the darkness of night is more real than the white stage of the cinema.

I saw four small boys wending their way stationwards on the morning of a hot twelfth of July in 1895. It was Tayville's turn to have the Orange celebration for Eastern Ontario, and a "special" was due at ten o'clock. The arrival of a train which brought not only all the loyal Orangemen from neighbouring towns but their wives and sweethearts as well was an event which no really enterprising boy would dream of missing. It mattered not to what camp his parents belonged—indeed this particular group, the inner circle of the West Ward gang, included two Protestant and two Roman Catholic boys—the fun was free to all. There was the joy of being in the midst of the good-natured holiday crowd on the platform; of telling the East Ward boys how badly they were going to be beaten in lacrosse the following Saturday; and of saying "Here she comes," when the whistle blew and the smoke of the engine could be seen in the distance. There was the excitement of seeing the train pull in amid the welcoming cheers of the crowd, of watching the visitors unfurl their banners as they made ready to parade up town, and of falling in beside them as they marched off to the tune of "The Protestant Boys." And all the way to the Exhibition grounds there was the fun of watching the local "King Billys," with their befeathered caps, trying to ride their grey mares as if it were a daily occurrence.

The scene shifts. It is an autumn evening in 1901, and the same four boys, bigger and rougher but not unrecognizable, are again at the station. The crowd in which they are to be seen awaits the arrival of "the local"—to be official, Tayville local, train No. 320, due at 9.15 p.m. daily, Sundays excepted. At 6.30 a.m. this train leaves Tayville for Montreal, stopping at every village and hamlet along the line to pick up milk and

cream cans, empty bread boxes, and an occasional passenger. In the afternoon it returns leaving full bread boxes and empty cans all along the route until finally a train nearly empty and a weary crew arrive at Tayville. In fine weather, especially in summer, "meeting the local" is a pastime favoured by a few with either more imagination or more curiosity than their fellow-citizens possess. To some it is a matter of first importance to know the movements of their neighbours; to others the train is a link with the far-off country to which they too may some time travel.

On this particular occasion, however, the platform is crowded, for the mayor, the reeve, the councillors, the band, indeed representatives of every class are there to celebrate the home-coming of Sergeant Norman Reed. Two of Tayville's sons had enlisted in the First South African Contingent. For one a memorial service had been held a year ago; the other had come safely through and a royal welcome awaits him. Out of the darkness the whistle of "the local" is heard; the excitement increases; finally pent-up feelings find relief in deafening cheers as the train pulls into the station. Shoulder-high the sergeant is carried to the carriage-and-four reserved for him. his parents, and the mayor. With much difficulty the procession gets under way, the band leading and a vast crowd of boys with torchlights bringing up the rear. As the picture fades, I see the station in the yellow, smoky light cast by the torches. It is not difficult to imagine that it is giving its blessing to the townsfolk whose lives are so bound up with itself. . . .

But processions which left that old building were not all joyful, nor were bands always playing. Sometimes when there was music, it was the strains of the Dead March from *Saul* that were heard, not those of the Conquering Hero. I recalled a winter's day in 1899 when the funeral of the Hon. J. G. Blackmore was held on the arrival of the afternoon train from Ottawa. There was pomp and ceremony on that occasion, but

the drums of the band were muffled, and even the small boys walked in silence.

Still more vividly there came to my mind a day when all the boys of Tayville High School paid their last tribute to a popular teacher who had died in the middle of the summer term. In funeral procession they marched from his home to the station, and with bowed heads they watched the train pull out with all that remained of their beloved master.

Sleep finally put an end to my musing, but confused dreams made my slumber far from restful. Whistles shrieked and bells clanged; trunks piled high tumbled down and nearly crushed me; and once I wakened with a start just as a powerful engine was about to run over me. In the morning I was awakened from a more pleasant dream in which the express-man at Tayville station was carrying on an animated argument with my friend the baggageman. The express-man, a true radical and somewhat of an orator, was expatiating on the great advantages of the present over the slow-moving past.

"Why, Mike," said he, "you know yourself that since we have had a motor truck it takes me only half the time to make my rounds every morning."

"Yes," countered Mike, "except the days when she breaks down and you spend half an hour on your back trying to locate the trouble." But Mike was much older than the express-man and had long since viewed the past in the light of the glamour with which age so often surrounds it. Just as consciousness was returning, I heard him say, "All through the summer there wasn't a week when we did not have at least four wedding parties. Now we are lucky if we get one a month. They all want to sneak off in a motor-car."

A busy morning kept my thoughts on other matters, but midday found me once again at Tayville station waiting to take the Inter-City for Montreal. The train being a few minutes

late, I was able to tell Mike Sullivan that I understood something of what he felt about the departed glories of the past. "Yes, I knew you would, Jimmie," said he. "Of course this place ain't dead yet, not by any means, and I ought to tell you that only three years ago this old building saw the biggest crowd in its history, not exceptin' the good old days of excursion trains. You see it was this way. The Prince of Wales was on his last Ontario tour. Tayville, of course, could not expect a visit from him, but the mayor tried hard to get his special train to stop for ten minutes on its way to Ottawa. Even that could not be managed, but the mayor was notified that when the train went through at eight o'clock in the evening the Prince would appear on the observation end of the last coach. Jimmie, you may not believe it, but I doubt if one hundred people were left in the village that evening. You see that long new platform across the tracks. Well, from one end to the other it was black with people. They were as thick as bees in a beehive. Boys and girls, young and old, parents with youngsters in their arms, parents with grey hair like myself, even grandparents, all were there. There was Pete Doran, and Pat Murphy—do you mind them?—and dozens of fellows like that who never come near this place. And they were rewarded, too, for, dang me, I never thought a train could move so slowly without actually stopping. It took exactly fifteen minutes for that engine to crawl from one end of the platform to the other, and all the time the Prince stood on the end platform bowing and smiling with that smile you see in the pictures. I tell you, Jimmie, there wasn't a man, woman, or child in the whole crowd who did not go home happy and, as for the young ladies, believe me, it was a good thing Edward P. did not get off the train that night. . . ."

At this stage in Mike's graphic story, the Inter-City came rushing along, and I had to make my farewell. Like the Prince of Wales, I stood on the rear platform of the train, and

watched the old stone building rapidly disappear from view. As I stood there, thoughts of the dreams of a small boy of the 'nineties were uppermost in my mind. Many of them had come true, for he had viewed the Alps from the train that climbs from Flüelen to Göschenen, and had gazed with admiration on the beauty of the Laurentians in Quebec. And yet, at forty-five, he was beginning to learn that the secret of life could be found even by those whose journeys never took them far from Tayville.

II. THE LIVERY STABLES

In the 'nineties, Tayville had six livery stables. At that time man's faithful friend, the horse, was at the height of his popularity; signs of his approaching overthrow by the internal combustion engine were already visible on the horizon but, for still a few years, the supremacy of the horse was to remain unchallenged. His services for transportation and for pleasure were in constant demand, and directly or indirectly, this noble animal was responsible for the livelihood of many men. If to-day numerous industries centre about the motor car, it is no less true that a generation ago there were many places of business whose existence depended on the horse. Of these, the place of honour must be given the livery stable. Neither picturesque like the blacksmith shop and its glowing forge, nor prominently located on the main business street like Bill Smith's harness shop, it was none the less the home where many horses ate and slept and had their daily grooming.

As might be expected, competition was keen among the various proprietors of Tayville's stables. It was never bitter, however, probably because each had his own specialty which brought him a fair amount of business unsolicited by the others. With Jack Brady it was buses; those high four-wheeled vehicles with a broad driver's seat in front, with two long bench-like seats running lengthwise in the rear, and with a canopy over-

head to protect the occupants from the heat of a summer sun or from the downpour of an occasional shower. As in these carriages accommodation was provided for fourteen, or even sixteen, if there was no objection to a little crowding, the three which Jack Brady owned were in great demand. To be sure of a bus for the Twenty-fourth of May or for the First of July, picnic parties found it necessary to make arrangements several weeks beforehand, while each June the various Sunday Schools took great care to avoid conflicting dates for their annual outings.

Pete Furlong did all the commercial travellers' business. This was to be expected, for his stable was directly opposite the yard of the Windsor Arms, Tayville's most important hotel. Realizing the advantages of such a situation, Pete, when quite a young man, had provided himself with two long wagons especially designed for conveying a traveller and his pile of trunks at a reasonable speed to the neighbouring villages. As Tayville was the nearest railway station to a place as large as Leven, with a population of over one thousand, business with this village alone was of considerable importance and the tires of Pete's wagons never grew rusty from idleness.

Jim Wilson specialized in the "snappy" outfits in great demand by the young bloods of Tayville. With these gentlemen a single-seated, uncovered buggy with rubber-tired wheels was in favour. Although new models were not introduced with quite the rapidity shown by automobile manufacturers, in Victorian days there were fashions in buggies as in all other things, and Jim Wilson always had the latest outfits. It was rumoured that he had twice as many bad debts as any of his competitors but, in spite of that, his business thrived. Having the ultra-fashionable, he was able to command a higher fee for his services.

Jim's greatest rival was Pat O'Neill, proprietor of the

Palace Livery, because Pat, too, had smart turnouts. The rivalry between them, however, was only on the surface, for Pat's chief aim in life in no way interfered with Jim's business. He sought to carry off first prize for the best single roadster and for the best-matched driving team at every Fall Fair within a radius of twenty-five miles from Tayville. With such an ambition, up-to-date carriages were of course necessary, but it was to the horse, not to the carriage, that O'Neill's major attention was directed. Indeed so well did he look after their welfare, that money could not persuade him to let out for hire any of his horses if he thought there was the slightest chance of ill-treatment on the part of the driver. With such care, it was not surprising that his horses were known beyond the precincts of his native town. In particular, a perfectly matched jet-black, glossy team of high steppers was deservedly famous, for it had carried off first prize at every fair in the county six years in succession. To Pat that was a matter both of pride and of profit, for, in days when a "dollar-ten" was the ordinary day's wage of a labourer, prize money formed no small part of his income.

In one sense the Richardson Brothers Horse Exchange ought not to be included in the list of Tayville's livery stables, as the chief concern of these gentlemen was the buying and selling of horses. In boarding-house language, they took only transients, and, as is frequently the case with temporary boarders, the number fluctuated greatly. At times their stables were almost empty; a few weeks later they might be filled to capacity with twenty or more sturdy animals just received from the West. Although their horses were always for sale, the Richardsons kept a few carriages and were not averse to making a little "on the side" by letting them out for hire. On holidays and special occasions, when the regular liveries could not supply the demand, it was usually possible to obtain a horse from them. As a rule, however, the driving folk of

Tayville were not eager to avail themselves of this opportunity. The temper of Richardsons' horses was bound to be a little uncertain and few could forget two or three bad runaway accidents chalked up against them.

Timid drivers patronized Jock Gordon, who made a specialty of keeping quiet, good-tempered horses, guaranteed not to shy at either a train or a bicycle. They were not noted for their speed, but in days when "joy-riding" was a phrase unknown to the newspapers, that was not a serious drawback. Jock's stable was called "The Horses' Home," a fitting name for two reasons. In the first place, he rarely bought or sold an animal and many in his stable had been in his possession for years. Indeed, his customers knew most of his horses by name, and, at more than one house, these wise animals expected either an apple or a lump of sugar before starting on a journey. In the second place, two of Tayville's prominent citizens, Dr. Stephen and Col. Anderson, found it more convenient to put their horses in Gordon's care than be bothered with a private stable. In so doing, these gentlemen conferred a double benefit on Jock, for he received not only a substantial yearly remuneration but also the free advertisement arising from the presence of their horses in his stable.

In my boyhood days Jock Gordon's livery was in the centre of the neighbourhood most frequented by the inner circle of the West Ward gang, and, as one of that number, it was my good fortune to spend many happy hours in and about that Home for Horses. Gordon's stable has long since disappeared, but I can still picture the drab, wooden structure, which even the softening brush of Time cannot make beautiful. A huge opening large enough to permit the easy passage of a team and carriage gave entrance to the central part of the livery where the incoming horses were unhitched. Through a doorway on the left the animals were led into the stable proper, a long narrow compartment with accommodation for twelve

stalls, each with a small window high above the horse's head. Above the doorway a somewhat faded but still legible motto, "Cleanliness is next to godliness," could be read by all visitors, but to this day I know not whether it was put there as a piece of advice for the general public or as an indication of the manner in which Jock Gordon looked after his horses. Certainly by a liberal use of whitewash and by excessive care in the daily cleansing of each stall, his stable amply justified the legend above the doorway.

The establishment was completed by a small office on the right, and by a shed in the rear, where the carriages were placed after the unhitching of the horses. This structure was by far the largest part of the livery, for in it room had to be found for eight buggies, two surreys, one bus, one phaeton, and all the cutters and sleighs used in the winter. To save ground space, it was of two stories, a steep incline at one end providing the means by which sleighs could be brought to the upper storey.

It was natural that such a place should have a great fascination for the boys in its neighbourhood. It was the day of bits and bridles, not gas and gears, of reins and traces, not cars and carburetors, and the real meaning of such words could best be learned in the school of experience. At Jock Gordon's, we of the inner circle learned how to harness a horse with check-rein just right and breeching strap not too tight; we knew how to proportion oats and hay, when to give a horse water and when not; and, as for driving, we thought ourselves a match for the liveliest colt in the town. In the 'nineties there was just as much fun in driving a horse as to-day a boy finds in handling a car, and an occasional drive was the reward we received for our services—with one important exception. For every buggy we washed Jock gave us ten cents and, in so doing, provided us with a satisfactory means of increasing our pocket-money during the summer holidays. The money was well

earned, too, for Tayville had not yet installed a water system, and at least four pails of water were needed for a single buggy. Fortunately a public pump stood on a corner not fifty yards from the livery, and we were able to do a creditable job with nothing more serious than wet shoes and stockings.

To get our pay for such work, Jock always made us call at his office. This small room where accounts were kept, was clean and tidy, and, indeed, almost homelike in its general appearance. The walls were covered with pictures, framed and unframed, chiefly of racing horses like Dan Patch, whose fame at that time extended over many counties. By the curtained window stood an old-fashioned table desk, with a high back of shelves and cubby-holes. The whole of one side of the room was taken up by a leather-covered couch; in the centre was a small box-stove, while distributed about the room were five or six chairs, at least two with comfortable cushions. I used to wonder why Jock had such excellent seating accommodation because, during the day, loafers were not tolerated around his livery, and, in the evenings, we boys were put in the same undesirable category. The reason I learned by accident one evening when my father and I were returning a horse after a day in the country. It was about the time that Tayville Town Council was considering the advisability of installing a water and an electric light system, and, as we drove into the livery, it was impossible not to hear a heated discussion on this subject. In spite of the barrage of smoke which filled the office, a glimpse through the door showed me that every chair in the room and the sofa as well were occupied. There was Dr. Ross, "Doc" Kelly, the "vet.", Bill Smith, the harness-maker, Tom Sanderson of the carriage works, Jock Gordon himself, and two or three others whom at the moment I could not place. As we waited to see the proprietor, Doc. Kelly with much waving of arms, was enlarging on the terrific cost of laying pipes in the granite streets of Tayville.

The reason for the chairs was obvious. That comfortable corner was the unofficial club-room of one of those informal groups which met night after night to discuss the affairs of the town. That, however, is a theme in itself and the tale of those groups and their discussions must be left for another chapter in the history of Tayville.

THE CLAIMS OF FRENCH-CANADIAN POETRY

BY E. K. BROWN

WHEN Mr. Joseph McCabe was last in Toronto, some one who was looking for a weakness in his polymathematical mind requested his opinion of the prospect for Canadian literature. In rejoinder Mr. McCabe asked the significant but tiresome question—does it exist? The interviewer was discomfited but surely his discomfiture was unnecessary: he might have silenced Mr. McCabe, who is an excellent judge of poetry, with a single verse of Canadian poetry:

“Ma pensée est couleur de lumières lointaines,”

and, for good measure he might fearlessly have continued with its sequent:

“Du fond de quelque crypte aux vagues profondeurs.”

To quote these verses, recalling as they do the enigmatic music and the autumnal sensibility of Verlaine, is perhaps the readiest way with any bland scoffer at Canadian literature. The brief lyric of which they are the opening verses, a sheaf of equally brief lyrics almost identical in tonality and by the same poet, supplied, until very recent years, the most admirable aesthetic experience that Canadian poetry in either of our languages had to offer. Minor poetry it is, if you will, but it is minor poetry of genius.

The unfortunate boy who wrote these poems would seize Mr. McCabe's imagination: his life has been almost ideally tragic. Too proud to submit to any kind of manual or clerical work, derided and neglected by the pretentious mutual-admiration societies of literati in Montreal, he got his food from garbage-cans and slept where he could. One must not blame too bitterly the poets who rejected him. For them the acme of poetry was the romanticism of Victor Hugo, muscular

and brilliant, or the demi-romanticism of Lamartine, or, which was even more threatening to Emile Nelligan, the stiff glittering pomp of the Abbé Delille. Nelligan was a precursor of a new poetic movement fatal to all the things his Canadian contemporaries held dear, a *confrère* of Rimbaud, and Francis James and Verlaine. Isolated and obdurately refusing to conform, he went from neurosis to neurosis, from megalomania to a destructive mania of persecution: he was quite conscious of his plight, of the path he trod and of the place to which it led: and at eighteen he arrived at the end of his path and passed behind the doors of an asylum and there, after thirty years, he still is. The whisper has been about, started perhaps by men of letters who have visited him, that even behind those doors of mental death, the poetic life of Emile Nelligan subsists and issues in weird and winning music that we may some day hear.

The poetry of Nelligan is as slight in texture and content as in quantity. It has two principal values,—as a passionate record of the phases in his mental collapse and as a no less passionate record of his very delicate and bizarre perceptions of external objects. The autobiography of Nelligan is simple and tragic. He was aware that to retain or retrieve his sanity he required cordial effective contacts with other people and other things, contacts which should let into his packed, strained mind sun and air and common sights and concepts. He was also aware that he was disqualified for these salutary contacts by that very fullness and tension that they should relieve. He saw himself imprisoned more and more tightly in his own mad self and he acquired little by little a pensive pride in his prison. There could be but one end for such a history; as he himself wrote, his mind

His impressions of external things resemble those of his French contemporaries: the thing is perceived sideways, as it

a sombré dans l'abîme du Rêve.

were, and at one incalculably rapid glance and is almost at once submerged by curious and often factitious but never vacuous associations. The value of the thing, the value of the instantaneous perception of the thing, are but incidental: the genuine, supreme value is in the complex of associations.

Before the unaccountable appearance of Nelligan, many things had happened in French Canadian poetry and some of note, but few which would go far to persuade Mr. McCabe of the claims of Canadian literature. There had been Fréchette, for example, who has the perennial interest of a founder, Fréchette who gave French Canadian literature its *droit de cité* in the French speaking world. Even in our own day, no Frenchman or Spanish American sincerely fond of letters would care to confess to ignorance of the *Légende d'un peuple* (1887) or *Oiseaux de Neige* (1880), crowned by the French Academy. Fréchette was an authentic romantic spirit, a little pretentious and more than a little primitive, but he did succeed in recapturing the glamour, and the pain too, of the French occupation of America, the discovery, the exploration of pathless woods and endless rivers, the diffusion of religion, military victory and military disaster. He wrote of these in a stirring Parkmanesque manner and with vim enough to chase the spirit of dejection from any reader. Before Fréchette, there had been Octave Crémazie, bookseller, polyglot, flâneur, purveyor of the richest treasures of Mediterranean culture on the banks of the Saint Lawrence. He it was who restored to French Canada its transatlantic heritage. In this respect, his importance is inestimable and no one would wish to speak lightly of him, even if to read his lumbering stanzas is now no better than a labour of love. He had, it is true, an ear for Lamartinian sequences of words and for flights of grandiose Senecan rhetoric, and he was capable of indefinitely sustained, if not refined, emotion. But of poetry he had not a whiff. It is impossible, besides, and moreover would

be improper, to forget that he is the claimed source of that particularist tendency in Quebec which will foul not only England and English Canada and all other expressions of the rival culture, but France also, the cultural metropolis of Quebec.

So much for the predecessors of Nelligan. His successors make a better showing. After Nelligan, Lozeau, of whom Mr. Swift recently wrote in the *QUEEN'S QUARTERLY*. Lozeau was Nelligan's elder contemporary, but by virtue of the precocity and the premature silence of Nelligan, and the gradual unfolding of Lozeau, he is properly considered as a successor. After Nelligan, Lozeau, after a neurotic, an invalid; "the martyrology of Canadian thought continues," wrote Louis Dantin. Albert Lozeau won to a certain serenity, precarious, often interrupted, but never really displaced; and this serenity is the ground-tone of his best poetry. Not that he was in the least emasculate: he has the serene invalid's pathetic admiration for naïve passion and ready valour. But the quintessence of his poetry is not in this expression of frustration: its quintessence, not in the least novel, is a charming and genuine echo of a continental poet, somewhat his senior and somewhat his superior in craftsmanship, a parochial poet, a bourgeois poet, if you will, but a discreet and sincere artist. The distinction of Lozeau is to have recaptured the *poésie intime* of Francois Coppée with its careful, mild notations of ordinary men and things, with its robust peasant love of physical nature.

Albert Ferland is a poet of whom no English Canadian can write with pleasure or even with patience. As a collaborator with the Abbé Lionel Groulx, M. Antoine Perrault, and other root-and branch particularists in the review entitled, before a certain drastic papal pronouncement, *L'Action Française*, and, more recently with a somewhat halting deference, *L'Action Canadienne-Française*, he has placed his deli-

cate poetic art at the service of a spacious ideal. What he wrote before 1900 we shall make no mistake in neglecting. What he wrote in the first fifteen years of the present century, and notably in the volumes *Les Horizons* (1908) and *Le Terroir* (1909) revealed an interesting love of nature, now tranquil and now tumultuous, but always intense and persuasive. In his rare moments of authentic experience, Albert Ferland perceived and could convey the two chief things in pantheism, the unity of all phenomena and our intimacy with them. Even an obtrusive particularism has not entirely ruined this poetry of Ferland, just as an obtrusive doctrinaire pessimism never could ruin the poetry of Byron. But Albert Ferland is now a civil servant who writes poetry rather than a poet, and a proficient in the literature of hatred.

More important than Ferland, more important than Lozeau, important not only as a various and finished poet but also as a *chef-de-fil*, is Paul Morin. Paul Morin is the first rounded cosmopolitan, cosmopolitan that is to say both in the range of his sensibilities and in the range of his positive experience, to find expression in French Canadian poetry. He is the true continuator, despite extraordinary surface differences, of Nelligan; Nelligan excepted, Paul Morin appears to be the first French-Canadian poet who is a man before he is a Québécois, a soul before he is a member of a parish. And in positive experience, he has enormous advantage over Nelligan; who indeed could in this realm differ so abysmally from our provincial Verlaine as the competent investigator in comparative literature, doctor of the Sorbonne, barrister, secretary of the Ecole des Beaux-Arts of Montreal, — Paul Morin?

The last mentioned agreeable function is an index to the mind of Paul Morin. The charm of Nelligan is musical; the charm of Paul Morin is pictorial. He is blessed with visual impressions of extraordinary vivacity and poignancy; and

even in the medium of words, usually destructive to such impressions, they retain, with Paul Morin, an overwhelming force, an apparently indelible outline. One supposes that the lure of the Mediterranean basin, so strong for this poet, is not primarily archeological or sentimental. Italy, Greece, Turkey, Morocco, Provence,—these are for Paul Morin lands where the fierce force of the sun sharpens the outlines of architecture and of nature herself. The mild skies of central and northern France rarely develop such visual power as Paul Morin's. And the line of French colourists in words, where Morin takes an honourable place, is dominated by three great poets born in tropical or near-tropical places, Leconte de Lisle, *facile princeps*, born in the Ile Bourbon, beneath an African sky, José-Maria de Hérédia, born in Cuba and of mixed race, Jean Moréas, born in Athens. Since the death of Moréas French poetry has turned into other channels. The shade of Mallarmé is mighty still; and in our own day, the day of Paul Valéry and Jean Cocteau, poets are interested not in the representation or description of phenomena but in their significance. It is not then a rash compliment, it is not perhaps enough of a compliment, to say for Paul Morin, that with the intelligible exception of Henri de Régnier who married the daughter of Hérédia and has Parnassian affinities, no continental Frenchman obviously outpoints him in the field of word-painting which has been thus far his favorite. His only peers have the advantage of tropical birth or residence, men like the Haitain poet, Burr-Reynaud.

In 1927 a slender volume of lyrics with the winning title, *A Travers les Vents*, came, introduced by the whimsical pen of "Henri d'Arles" from the press of Louis Carrier. This volume is moral dynamite; and its author, Robert Choquette (then in his teens) is a spiritual liberator, as Nelligan was an emotional liberator and Paul Morin a technical liberator, of French Canada. It is not enough to welcome it as a promise;

for it is an important performance, a violent but coherent attempt to reduce the morbid discrepancy between the mental life which the French Canadians have inherited and piously, indeed obsequiously, conserve and the practical life to which the physical aspect of Canada, the solitude and independence which it encourages, with their concomitant free emotions and inquisitive mind, and the social aspect of Canada, our novel forms of economic and domestic life, invite the race. The timid traditionalism of their emotions, the mechanical scholasticism which is still predominant in their thoughts even on profane subjects are for Choquette anachronisms and enraging servitudes. His newly enfranchised spirit:

Libre des vains travaux de la vaine raison,
Avide seulement d'un plus vaste horizon,

---as he sang in his impetuous *Offrande à la Nature*, which he preferred to publish in a Parisian anthology,—makes a practice of that naked intimacy with nature, which for Albert Ferland was but a creed. His inspirations are incarnations of the spirit of absolute liberty—the Red Eagle, Dollard des Ormeaux, the ocean and the inaccessible stars.

Victor Hugo is the principal master of Choquette; and in the disciple as well as in the master, are the dazzling images perfectly fused with the idea, strange suggestions, the indefinable treading on the heels of the trivial, the frantic worship and desire of nature, the proud possession of an inviolable personality. Choquette finds, as Hugo did, his surest happiness in a continuous sense of the unity of all being and, within this universal unity, the specific unity of mankind.

Diffuse the lyrics of Choquette undoubtedly are, and vociferous too, at times; nevertheless, no poet of our day in France has the *souffle*, the surging line, the tempest of passion for which Hugo was famous—and these verses from *Offrande à la Nature* have them all in generous measure:

Je ne suis rien, je suis faible, je passerai
Comme une ombre d'oiseau sur la neige, et la vie
Aura fermé ses yeux dans mon âme ravie,
Tout sera consommé, tout mort, tout accompli,
Que ton éternité n'a pas encore un pli!
Je ne suis rien, Nature, et lorsque vient l'aurore
C'est une vérité qu'il faut savoir encore . . .
Je ne suis rien, Nature, et je n'ai qu'à bénir.
Je bénis le présent, je bénis l'avenir:
D'autres enfants viendront dans leur jour qui se lève
Continuer ma vie et reprendre mon rêve,
Des villes grandiront sur les hameaux détruits;
Il est bien d'autres fleurs, d'autres jours, d'autres fruits,
D'autres yeux à s'ouvrir dans ta main créatrice,
O Nature, et je fais mon humble sacrifice. . .

Only Swinburne could produce a worthy English version of these lines,—and Swinburne would not perhaps have understood the thrill of renunciation, the brave and happy acceptance of death. But that is a thrill that Mr. Joseph McCabe would understand and savour. And I do not believe that if he had been shown *Offrande à la Nature*, he would have left Canada without buying a copy of the admirable anthology which contains it and without getting many of its verses by heart.

THE HOUSE OF BARINGS AND CANADA

BY GEORGE E. SHORTT

THE firm of Baring Brothers, of London, was founded in the latter part of the eighteenth century by Francis Baring and during the Napoleonic period it rose to be one of the greatest banking "houses" in the world. How this came to pass is quite a romantic drama in which Napoleon, Pitt, and the outstanding figures of the age were actors. The hand of the Barings was evident in sustaining British finance during the French wars and in rehabilitating France after the Treaty of Vienna. They were active in the Far East and in Russia. They were intimately connected with the purchase of Louisiana from Napoleon and its transfer to the United States.

When Alexander Baring succeeded his father as head of the firm the United States had begun to bulk large in English eyes. He protested against the measures which brought about the War of 1812, as his father had protested against the coercion of the colonies before the Revolutionary War. His pen conclusively answered James Stephen's tract, *War in Disguise*, and later, as Lord Ashburton, he settled with Daniel Webster the troublesome disputed boundary between Quebec, New Brunswick, and Maine.

Before Lord Ashburton's retirement he took into the firm two gentlemen who were to maintain its high traditions. These were his nephew, Thomas Baring, and Joshua Bates, of Massachusetts. Joshua Bates conducted the American interests and Thomas Baring those, among others, of Canada. In the United States the Barings were agents and bankers for the federal government and for several of the state governments, the Bank of the United States, commercial firms, and railway companies. They financed the purchase of Texas from Mexico and of Alaska from Russia. Their greatest contribution, however,

was a steady and powerful influence for honesty, regularity, and conciliation, which was sadly needed in the new continent.

In British North America the Barings were agents for the Governments of Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick. They acted for the corporations of the cities of Quebec and Montreal. Conjointly with Glyn, Mills and Company they were involved by the Canadian Government, much against their wish and even without their consent, in the Grand Trunk Railway Company and maintained an arduous struggle to keep it from bankruptcy in spite of almost insuperable difficulties and in the face of much hostility on both sides of the Atlantic. They were in communication with the leaders of finance, business, and government throughout British North America. They were informed of important events, consulted on financial undertakings, asked to lend money and to sell securities. They observed closely the development of the colonies and their relations with the United States and England until Confederation, advising, correcting, and sometimes scolding, but always exerting their influence in the cause of harmony, sanity, and good faith. A study of the correspondence of the firm relative to American affairs, which extend over half a century, brings into high relief the instability and irrationality of democracy as then in vogue in North America.

There is a running commentary and discussion on Canadian relations with the United States from the Maine Boundary dispute and the McLeod Incident to the Reciprocity Treaty and the delicate situations and hard feelings engendered by the Civil War, the Alabama Claims, and the Fenian activities along the border. The financial organization and prospects of the St. Andrews and Quebec Railway, the Champlain and St. Lawrence Railway, the Quebec and Richmond Railway, the Port Dalhousie and Thorold Railway, the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Railway, and the Northern Pacific Railway are touched upon, as well as the Intercolonial; but the greater

part of the papers dealing with Canada relate to the Grand Trunk.

The Bank of British North America, the Bank of Montreal, the Bank of Upper Canada, and the Colonial Bank of Canada figure in the correspondence, as do the commercial firms of John A. Perkins, of Montreal, Ross, Shuter & Co., of Quebec, and Ross, Mitchell & Co., of Toronto. A consolidated municipal loan for Upper Canada was offered to the Barings by D. G. Boulton, while William Hamilton Merritt tried persistently but unsuccessfully to interest them in the Welland Canal and Railway.

There are letters from such influential persons as S. L. Tilley, John Rose, and A. T. Galt on the prospects and success of Confederation, together with extracts from the Canadian and British Press. John Rose also carried on an extensive correspondence with the Barings between 1867 and 1870 on the subject of the financing of the Intercolonial Railway. In 1852, N. Simpson, then cashier of the Bank of Montreal in Montreal, and John Ryan, of the same city, endeavoured to interest the Barings in a loan proposed by the Montreal City Corporation, but the Barings would not agree to the proposal without alterations and, as these were not acceptable in the first instance, the negotiations fell through.

Financial relations existed between the Barings and the Corporation of the City of Quebec for many years. In 1852 William Stevenson, acting for the City which had already issued £80,000 in bonds and loaned £150,000 to railway companies, requested the Barings to take a further issue of £70,000. The Barings agreed to take £40,000 at once with an option on the remainder. The next year a further loan of £50,000 was broached but the Barings replied that the market was inauspicious. Later, however, they agreed to handle an issue of £80,000, half of which was to retire bonds already outstanding. In 1854 Joseph Morrin, Mayor of the city, sug-

gested a still further issue, but the Barings postponed it until 1855 when they agreed to take £30,000 with the prospect of another like amount later. By 1857 the Barings still had £33,000 of the city's bonds on hand and unsaleable, while the city owed them £11,000. On an appeal from Morrin, however, they advanced a further £25,000. The next year the Barings accepted a final £6,000 in bonds, which ended their new business with the City of Quebec. By 1865 the city found itself overwhelmed in debt, and it was found necessary to place its financial affairs in the hands of commissioners. A bill was passed by the Legislature in 1865 to this effect. The following year the city suffered a disastrous fire, and it was only after many years that its liabilities were liquidated. Between 1866 and 1870 John Rose followed the process of this liquidation in his letters to the Barings.

In Nova Scotian affairs Joseph Howe and Dr. Tupper were the principal correspondents. Prospects for placing a Provincial loan in England were discussed from 1852 to 1854, but it was not until 1855 that arrangements were completed. Twice during that period Howe applied for personal loans, first for five hundred pounds, and later for a thousand pounds. Both of these were refused by the Barings on the grounds that, in view of Howe's official relations with them in placing the Provincial bonds, such private loans were open to grave misunderstanding. The proposed bond issue, amounting to £800,000, was to be used chiefly for railway purposes and the proceeds were to be drawn at the rate of £200,000 a year. The rate of interest offered was six per cent., with dividends payable at the Barings' "counting house."

Again, in 1865 it was proposed to float Provincial bonds for railway purposes to the extent of three or four hundred thousand pounds. This time Dr. Tupper was entrusted with the negotiations. The Barings informed him that, provided the bonds were issued in a manner satisfactory to them, they would

advance £150,000 in three equal payments during 1866, and look to the future sale of the bonds for reimbursement. In 1867 the Barings were asked to dispose of a quantity of Provincial bonds in the hands of the Windsor and Annapolis Railway Company, but took occasion to inform Tupper that, as Provincial bonds were being disposed of in Nova Scotia and from thence finding their way to the London market, their "house" was being retarded in its efforts to dispose of the bonds for Provincial account. They had made heavy advances to the Government of Nova Scotia but were forced to await word from A. T. Galt as to the manner in which the new Dominion Government intended to handle the provincial debts. In the years immediately following Confederation the Barings were kept informed of financial and political affairs in Nova Scotia by the correspondence of John Rose, who wrote voluminously on all that pertained to their interests in Canada.

The Government of New Brunswick first approached the Barings in 1851 with a proposal to negotiate a bond issue for them. The proceeds were to be used for the St. Andrews and Quebec Railway. The Barings advised against floating such an issue at that time, but made an offer in case they decided to proceed with it. In 1856 Hon. Charles Fisher, on behalf of the Province, informed the Barings that it was proposed to issue bonds to the extent of £800,000, of which £50,000 would be required without delay. The Barings did not wish to contract for the issue, preferring a commission arrangement, but, after considerable discussion, authorized drafts to the extent of £50,000 in monthly amounts of £10,000. They were to repay themselves by sales of Provincial bonds when they could be disposed of advantageously. In 1856 and 1857 the Barings were able to place approximately one hundred thousand pounds of these securities. The remainder were left to be disposed of through the Railway Company. Two years later, in 1859, Hon. S. L. Tilley forwarded a complete resumé of the

financial and economic condition of the Province with a proposal for further financial assistance, but in the following year the Barings were forced to remind the Province through the Governor, the Hon. H. T. Manners-Sutton, that the Railway Commissioners owed them £54,400 and that the Provincial account was in no condition to meet this debit by a transfer. Bonds were soon forwarded to the Barings to cover their advances but they did not find a ready sale. The financial situation in the Province immediately before and immediately after Confederation is described at length by Tilley and Rose respectively in their communications to the Barings.

Conjointly with Thomas Wilson & Co., the Barings in 1836 contracted for a bond issue of the Government of Upper Canada amounting to £400,000 in five per cent. securities. Two years later Thomas Wilson & Co. were forced to suspend payments in consequence of the financial crisis of 1837. The Barings immediately wrote to the Government of Upper Canada offering to pay the half-yearly dividends about to fall due on the bonds placed by Thomas Wilson & Co. and payable at their offices, as well as on the bonds for which they had themselves contracted. J. H. Dunn, the Canadian Receiver-General, was on his way to England for the purpose of raising another loan when the Wilson collapse occurred. On his arrival he was without funds and without a banker. Finding his way to the Barings he was welcomed and provided with funds to meet his requirements. He thereupon advocated their appointment as Provincial agents. But, while this was passing in England, the Canadian Government, having heard of the Wilson collapse and picturing to themselves the Receiver-General stranded in England, wrote in haste to Glyn & Co., of London, appointing that firm Provincial agents and urging it to go to Dunn's assistance. The Glyns and Barings were intimately associated and on terms of mutual friendship. Hence, when the Barings learned of the official appointment

of their neighbours, they were quite content with the outcome, although they were later persuaded to act conjointly with the Glyns as the financial agents of the Canadian Government.

While Dunn was in England in 1837 he inquired of the Barings the terms on which they might be prepared to contract for a Canadian loan but was informed that it would be necessary for the Canadian Government first to pass the act authorizing such a loan and that they would then make an offer. The political disturbances then taking place in Canada made the loan impracticable for the next two years and it was not until after the union of the Canadas that the market was considered favourable. In the meantime the Barings' name had been substituted for that of Thomas Wilson & Co. on the £200,000 of bonds negotiated by the latter firm and, without the Barings' consent, they were being asked to advance the money to pay the dividends on the entire £400,000. They protested against this and pointed out that they had already advanced to the Government of Upper Canada more than ten thousand pounds.

In 1842 the Canadian Government advertised for tenders for £300,000 of four per cent. bonds. Later, six per cent. was offered to make them more attractive. In a correspondence with W. H. Merritt the Barings declined to accept the terms offered for a disposal of the bonds and at the same time informed him that the disputes between the Governor and the Legislature of Canada would materially interfere with any attempt to market them in England. With the full approval of the Barings, Francis Hincks in 1848 took up the question of the loan with Glyn & Co. and two years later the Barings and Glyns conjointly contracted for half a million six per cent. bonds of the Government of Canada at par. At the time of this loan it was announced that no further issues of Canadian bonds would be marketed in the early future. Yet, the next

year it was proposed to float an issue for the St. Lawrence and Atlantic Railway Company guaranteed by the Canadian Government. The market improved very considerably toward the end of 1851 and the Barings urged that if the bonds were to be disposed of advantageously they should be forwarded without delay and put before the public in the first months of the new year.

As three-quarters of the Baring Papers relating to Canadian affairs are concerned with the Grand Trunk Railway, it would be beyond the scope of this article to enter into details of the struggle against bankruptcy there described. From 1853 to Confederation the correspondence of the Barings affords a full and complete history of the financing of the Railway. As early as 1852 Baring Brothers and Glyn & Co. were approached by "a gentleman connected with the Stock Exchange" in London who submitted a prospectus of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and proposed that one partner from each firm should join the directorate. Both declined the offer as their time was already too fully occupied. At the end of the year, however, the Barings received a prospectus from Hon. John Ross, in which they found the name of Thomas Baring entered as a director of the Company, as well as that of George Carr Glyn, although neither of these gentlemen had been consulted. They were given to understand by Ross that their presence on the directorate was requested by the Canadian Government who wished them, as their financial agents, to watch over Canadian interests at the London Board. Thomas Baring replied that before he as a partner of Baring Brothers could consent to lend his name to the undertaking he would have to look very closely into the particulars of the proposed venture and consider in what the duties of a director would involve him. Baring and Glyn eventually came to the conclusion that their responsibility as financial agents doubtless required their participation in the direction of the Com-

pany. From that time forward until Confederation they had no rest from Grand Trunk affairs.

The Barings were in constant communication with the Canadian Government, successively through Hincks, Taché, Sir Edmund Head, Merritt, Cayley, Galt, and Cartier. They corresponded regularly with John Ross, the President of the Grand Trunk Company, and with Benjamin Holmes, John Rose, Sir Cusack Roney, and various directors and shareholders. They caused Thomas C. Blackwell to be appointed general manager and corresponded voluminously with him until his collapse and retirement. They were in close touch with Edward Watkins when he went to Canada on behalf of the London Board and with Wagstaff, the lawyer, in England. They availed themselves of the services of their representative and agent in the United States, Samuel G. Ward, of Boston, as also of the services of the noted American engineer, Captain Swift.

They sold bonds, raised loans, advanced money, and formulated plans to meet the Company's insatiable demands for funds. They urged the directors and officials of the Company to increase their efforts on its behalf, and advised and assisted in the management of the line, in its negotiations with contractors, in the prosecution of construction, and in the building of new extensions. They contended with dissatisfied and factious shareholders and an adverse public opinion. They urged, guided, and made available any such aid as the Canadian Government could be persuaded to give. In a word, they were the central and dynamic controlling and co-ordinating influence in the struggle to complete the Grand Trunk, preserve it from bankruptcy, and maintain it as a going concern. For this they received more abuse than appreciation, more loss than gain, and, in the end, only the satisfaction of knowing that their name had been preserved untarnished and that their responsibilities and obligations had been fulfilled.

It may be desirable to consider generally the influence of the Baring-Glyn connection on financial operations connected with the Provinces of British North America. In what way did they affect the expenditures of the Provinces? Was their influence on the whole beneficial or otherwise?

Certainly the transfer of the account of Upper Canada from the house of Thomas Wilson to the houses of Baring and Glyn represented a decided forward step for that Province. These new financial agents were two of the strongest and best-regarded firms in the world. None stood higher. The result of this new connection was an added prestige in the field of finance for Canada. This, in turn, had a decided effect upon the rates at which Canadian debentures might be issued and placed on the London market. It meant, even at a difference of one-half of one per cent. in the interest rate, a saving of many thousands of pounds, while the higher rate at which the bonds could be sold represented another considerable saving. In connection with the flotation of the Grand Trunk Company of Canada's issues, Thomas Baring remarked that "without our names the subscription list would never have filled." Undoubtedly the connection with the Barings enabled the Province to borrow more cheaply and more efficiently.

As facility in borrowing often leads to extravagance in expenditure, this lubricating of the machinery might have proved a questionable blessing had the Barings been ready to set the wheels in motion whenever they were requested to do so. But, as Thomas Baring had on more than one occasion to remark to finance ministers and governors of different British North American Provinces, the financial agents were "jealous of the credit of the Province," and would not countenance any measures which they believed might prove harmful to it. They were averse to borrowing in an unfavourable market at any time, and declined more than once to contract for Provincial loans when their flotation would have resulted in a deprecia-

tion of the Provincial credit. If a Province were in need of funds the Barings preferred to lend the money themselves until such time as its loan might be placed in a favourable manner and at a reasonable rate.

In some cases Canadian finance ministers showed too great a readiness to rely upon the Barings for funds which they found it difficult to secure elsewhere. When the Barings and Glynns first became the financial agents of Canada it was understood that debentures should be forwarded to them and sold before the proceeds were to be considered available. As the connection progressed, however, the Canadian Government slipped into the habit of securing advances on the bonds before they had been sold. Later, drafts on the financial agents for funds to be realized on Provincial bonds often reached London before the bonds themselves. It sometimes became necessary for the Barings to remind the Canadian and other Provincial Governments that they were "leaning rather heavily" upon their financial agents.

Undoubtedly the Provincial Governments would have abused the facilities offered by the prestige of their financial agents, had those agents been too weak or too complaisant to restrict them. Mingled, however, with their readiness to afford every reasonable assistance in the realization of prudent financial measures, the Barings evidenced a determination not to be involved in any extravagant or unbusinesslike ventures. Neither were they prepared to countenance improvidence through an unlimited extension of their credit. Their voluminous correspondence renders it quite evident that they sought to maintain a very nice balance in the execution of their difficult trust. As a result, the Provinces experienced an ease and efficiency in borrowing, without any encouragement to indulge in unwise expenditure.

Finally, the financial agents exerted a moral influence of inestimable value. They were careful that Provincial obliga-

tions should be met when they fell due, even to advancing their own money when the Government failed to provide funds in time. They promptly and emphatically denounced any measure which they considered unethical or savouring of bad faith. They were intensely proud of their own good name and anxious to maintain that of their clients, the British North American Provinces, who were not always equally careful for themselves. "We have the reputation of doing our business well," wrote Thomas Baring, and there is ample evidence to support him. Throughout all the difficult and compromising negotiations described in their correspondence the Barings invariably maintained an efficient and a high and honourable course which reflected its beneficent influence upon the Provinces in general.

THE TIGER

BY W. M. CONACHER.

HINDENBERG proclaimed in 1916 that the war would be won by morale. In 1917 there was more than a suggestion that France, the most sternly tested of the Western Powers, would lose by a failure in morale: she then called to the helm the implacable critic of former leaders, Georges Clemenceau—the Tiger.¹ In the same year Parliament in Britain felt that its morale was no longer equal to the continuance of the Asquith régime and little David ruled in his place. Despite incredible stress and strain Clemenceau and Lloyd George came successfully through the struggle, the latter steering his ship on a gyrating course, the other with firm grip on the wheel driving straight into the teeth of the storm, or rather keeping her head to the storm at half speed. Thus a man from La Vendée and a man from Carnarvon led the allied cause against the Hohenzollern and the German General Staff—a long skull and a round skull against the pear-shaped Prussian head!

Who was this Clemenceau to whom France turned in her hour of sharpest need, this doctor to whom it came for a tonic, well knowing that it would be of the bitterest? He was well on in his seventies, a mind thoroughly set; his label was Radical, yet we can think of no one who was more the incarnation of the conservative ideal. On the constructive side his record does not place him as more than a second-rate political leader, yet all France knew that his name meant death to abuse, and

¹It was of course President Poincaré who sent for Clemenceau, and necessarily he had to sink his own personal feelings to do so. But there was no one else, and the next discredited ministry might entail a break on the home front with Caillaux and *défaitisme* beginning to loom large on the political horizon. Still it was a fine act of patriotism on Poincaré's part.

that while he ruled there might be defeat but there would not be *défaitisme*...

What marks had he of this high calling? The first is that in 1871 as a young doctor who represented Montmartre in the Chamber—he had stuck to his post through the siege of Paris—with a few others he took the oath that he would never rest till the lost provinces were French again. Straight after that he went through that strange and bloody interlude, the Commune, when fiery idealists and shrieking demagogues sought to raise again the Red Cap of Revolution over the tombs of Marat, Hébert and Danton. Clemenceau stood for order, but he was one of those who pleaded strongest for pity for the misguided youth of this bloody Fronde of democracy.

The next of his “lawful occasions” was when he pricked the Boulanger bubble. France after 1871 was still strange to the republican idea. It was looking for a man. For want of a legitimate ruler it was seeking that Fascist ideal with which the lower Latin temperament seems to satisfy itself, and for a moment it appeared that a most ludicrous composition of buckram and pasteboard would meet its need. This figure was General Boulanger and it was Clemenceau with his unquestioned courage, his mordant Voltairean irony, who dared and flouted and ridiculed the illusion till it dissolved in smoke.

The next occasion was when he made himself one of the leaders of opinion which fought the celebrated *affaire Dreyfus*, and so righted a great wrong and cleansed the state of a foul abuse. It was his newspaper, *L'Aurore*, which published the great Philippics of Zola, and he himself suggested their title, *J'Accuse*. Here was fought out before the bar of public opinion the question whether Major Dreyfus was a convicted spy or the victim of a foul conspiracy.

Everything induced Clemenceau to throw himself into this struggle, once he had made up his mind that a great injustice had been done. He was like Cato in that the beaten side ap-

pealed to him. He had the high courage needed for such a rôle and—what counts in France—he was ready to follow up his arguments the morning after in the Bois with a skilled and ruthless blade.² He was quick to scent abuse in any form, and if he discovered an ulcer sapping the strength of France, hey presto, the knife! He was a life-long anticlericalist,³ having inherited the strain from his political forebear Gambetta, and here if ever and more than ever he saw *le clericalisme l'ennemi*.

He was then a man who put his principles first, and his first principle was *La Patrie*. He was, further, a man who did not seek or desire office and power, whose essential task was that of critic. Possibly he was guided here by a certain psychological intuition. As a corrective Clemenceau was admirable: as a constructive statesman he was never more than second class, and unconsciously he knew it. The marvel is that time was to give him in 1917-18 the opportunity to play his true rôle and to make it a grand rôle. I have selected the two outstanding occasions where he was the Triumphant Critic. There were others: hence his fame as the unseater of Ministers: his method, an irresistible leap, the tearing of cruel fangs, gave him the name of *Le Tigre*. He brought down Gambetta although he shared many of his views; he brought down Jules Ferry, disagreeing with his colonial policy on the score that it was harmful to dissipate French strength.⁴ Only in the Great Panama scandal his actions are obscure. One of the great

²A characteristic story:—he was fighting an opponent who kept executing masterly retreats, "Monsieur retire"—the gentleman withdraws, said Clemenceau, and threw down his sword refusing to continue the duel.

³It is even amusing to note how in the philosophic pages of *Au soir de ma pensée* the mere approach to any matter bordering on clericalism aroused in Clemenceau an angry waspish drone, while he goes out of his way to consume clerical controversialists on such a question as evolution in the vitriol of his wrath.

⁴In 1917 when forming his War Ministry he invited M. Paul Cambon, the late Ambassador at Berlin, to take office. Cambon told him frankly he had been a friend and supporter of Ferry and he thought Clemenceau had been cruel and unjust in his treatment of Ferry. "I can never be your friend. I will never pardon you that," he said with Gallic frankness. Clemenceau looked at him with one of those glances, when the material substance of the eye seems to assume a spiritual capacity; a glance which admitted the

rogues in that affair had shares in his newspaper, and Clemenceau perforce had to try to do something for him: but the picture of Clemenceau taking this wretched Jew to address his last despairing whimpers for mercy to the Minister of Justice, and then escorting him home late on a night which must end in collapse or suicide, is equally repulsive and painful. What is the Tiger doing *dans cette galère*?

It was indeed odd that Germany was responsible for his first Premiership. The Kaiser was demanding "his place in the sun." Delcassé, France's foreign Minister, was building up the system of Alliances with Russia and England which provoked the spirit in which German school boys were taught this catechism: "What is Germany? A country entirely surrounded by enemies." It all seems now a vicious circle but it must be remembered that Lord Salisbury's ideal of a concert of Europe had fallen through, for in an age of growing realism Britain had lost its influence on the continent because it had no conscript army.

Delcassé had refused a German demand to arbitrate the Moroccan question. A veiled ultimatum was served; France was not prepared to face the consequences and Delcassé had to go. It was the Tiger who pulled him down and the Tiger then entered the new government as Minister of the Interior.⁵ He retained this post when a few months later he became Prime Minister. In his turn he heard the rattle of the German sabre, but the moment was not well chosen. Clemenceau was prepared to concede minor points but he knew how to call the Teuton bluff. The German Ambassador came to see him in

fault perhaps, and yet passed it over. "C'est égal," he said. "Voulez-vous servir La France?" And Cambon said he would. The adjective cruel is frequently met with even in eulogies of him. The crazy Socialist youth who tried to assassinate him at the end of the war said when arrested: "I recognized him at once, he looked so ferocious and ugly."

⁵The story goes that entering the Premier's office Clemenceau was asked, "What will you have?"—there were various vintages in evidence—but Clemenceau calmly replied "The Ministry of the Interior" (the chief portfolio), and he got it.

full panoply, with the threat that if his conditions were not accepted he would ask for his passports. "In that case," said Clemenceau, "your excellency must lose no time. You have only two hours to catch the express for Berlin." The mailed fist was for a moment paralysed when the old duellist whipped out his sword so briskly.

His ministry however, did not fulfil all its promise. Cail-
laux indeed introduced the income tax, and one had always understood that Frenchmen were constitutionally incapable of paying income tax. But Clemenceau somehow destroyed the possibility of a strong government of the Left by his rigid individualistic attitude towards strikes. Here again it would be difficult to say he was wrong. French trades unionists in politics seemed to waver between a policy of blackmail and dreams of a social revolution. There was for all his bourgeois parentage a lot of the *paysan* in Clemenceau. If somehow French industry had been in the hands of small holders, he would have fought for them tooth and nail. As it was he recognized the right of masters equally with that of men; in fact he looked on property as sacred, even in the form of capital.

France had at this time several violent upheavals of labour. One recalls the fury of the fisher-folk against the government because the sardine harvest failed. There was an equally illogical and unbridled demonstration of the small wine makers of the south against foreign competition and the dominance of the big firms. Clemenceau accepted the challenge to authority and met force by force. Then it was the turn of the miners in the North. Here he interposed in person: he went down to the mining districts and spoke in the market square of a little town. He was willing, he said, to deal with the miners' own delegates, but he would not negotiate with Syndicalist officials. When he had given his message he pushed his way through the ugly crowd to the Mairie. There

were desperate elements in the mob. He might have been torn in pieces. I suppose those in his passage shrank before the gimlet of the old man's eye. When it came to active measures he called out the military and used the sappers to act as black-legs. Law and order triumphed but a strong socialist minority was established on the extreme left of French political parties, with a grudge against the state, and permanently outside power and office. But if the term Radical has any meaning, if there was any sincerity in the Tiger's professed admiration for the liberalism of Campbell-Bannerman, he does not come too well out of the affair:—no attempt at remedial legislation: no social reform: no sign of a first-class intelligence. The forces were now organized which could pull him down—he provoked them and fell. "*J'ai fait tomber tous les ministères, même le mien,*" he chuckled.

He now seemed to sink into a minor rôle. He went abroad on a lecturing tour in the Argentine, came back and resumed his pulpit in *L'Aurore*—a mixture of Cato and Mr. Maxse. He was now definitely the old man with something about him of the rogue elephant or the man-eater. He preserved himself carefully; he was a pioneer of the daily dozen. He was abstemious to a degree; this seemingly typical Frenchman was a teetotaller. One has a suspicion that there was some personal animus in his hates and dislikes—Poincaré, for example and later Foch. But, was there not the latent possibility of an equal animus against Lloyd George or Wilson?

We must give him credit for his passion, his one consuming flame—patriotism. People talk now dispassionately about war-guilt and apportion the blame equally. Is there any question that the United States now feels assured of an economic supremacy in the twentieth century, or that this supremacy implies a certain overlordship?⁶ And in the same

⁶An American professor says calmly that the States have a "mandate" for Latin America—a mandate, the modern synonym of protectorates of semi-barbarous countries. Has it a mandate for Chicago?

way at the dawn of the twentieth century everything pointed to a German overlordship and supremacy. Russia's prestige had been lowered by the Jap victory. Britain was "decadent" and falling behind. You could hardly talk with a German who did not swell with confidence and self-importance. And all this great industrial power was controlled by a military coterie. Small wonder that in Europe there was a sense such as Greece must have felt before the might of Persia was laid low. You felt it in Switzerland, in Holland, in Belgium, all round the fringes of Germany. Swarms of holiday-making Teutons in mock-tweeds marched across Trafalgar Square or Hyde Park corner with the air of "What a place to sack." The *malaise* was strongest in France, and then strangely enough France seemed to pass from apprehension to a new spirit of challenge. They say it was caused by the arrival of the second generation since 1870⁷ And here was Clemenceau, who as a young man had repudiated the cession of the Rhine Provinces, seeing the issue coming up again. And then the storm burst—Mulhausen, Liège, Charleroi, Nancy, Maubeuge, the Marne, Ypres, the Somme, Verdun, the Somme again—the war of millions, the five hundred miles of trenches, generals coming and going, governments changing over night, countries being wiped out, and French civilization at stake.

And what was it, this civilization? A country not highly industrialized, with a wide background of the agriculture of the scythe and the hoe, the antithesis of all trades union ideas; a country with an élite of an educated class, but claiming in all classes a universal power of logical thought; its government in the hands of the specialists of political factions who had brought the political game to a high perfection of tactique, but missed many of the deeper issues and longer views; a country largely emancipated from religious associations but with

⁷Romain Rolland interprets this period very clearly in the last two volumes of *Jean Christophe*.

a strong minority passionately devoted to their faith; a people imbued with a sense of the artistry of life in all provinces including dress and *la cuisine* as well as the theatre and art in its stricter sense; a country driven to nationalism by the presence of their rival and neighbour, but also by a pride in their traditions and their past, their conviction that in them was the inviolable flame of Graeco-Roman culture coupled, one might say, with a happy oblivion to the contribution of other peoples to the cause of modern civilization.

How much of all this Clemenceau incorporated in his vision of France one cannot know. Perhaps little more than an aspiration that the wind should blow over a France free from outside interference; that the national spirit might be left to work out its own future; that certain pestiferous people must be suppressed or strictly checked, notably the clericalists; that France must be guarded from possible diseases such as Communism: that other nations should be allowed to contribute to the well-being of this fine flower of civilization, and thereby to acquire merit; finally that it is pleasant in the evening to talk over one's garden gate to one's humble neighbours who pass by.

During the first years of the war Clemenceau was not in a position to exercise much direct influence on events. One remembers reading the hearty abuse he gave his *bête noire*, Poincaré, for being absent in the critical days—he was on a state visit to the Czar. He early took the Maxse rôle, declared the Minister of War incompetent and secured his downfall—there had to be a scapegoat for Mulhausen. In the Senate he was President of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which partly muzzled him, partly gave him an inside view of things. He was an unqualified Westerner; he was opposed to the removal of the seat of government to Bordeaux, for, tragically enough, he had been there before in 1871. But he believed in France, he was really

"One who never turned his back but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break."

He had now left *L'Aurore* and set up his own pulpit in *L'homme Libre*. It was suppressed and he revived it as *L'homme enchainé*.

The onslaught of the vast German military machine left him still unmoved, though he had none of the false comfort of the illusions that the man in the street enjoys, no steam roller, no Angels of Mons, no Russian reinforcements in France. On the other hand, he knew something of the imponderabilia in nations and he was professional enough never to offer advice or opinions in the field of strategy. "You must tighten your belt," was his only advice. His turn came in the darkest hour when he alone was left untried, and when he alone was the obvious centre and core of the spirit of French resistance. Then those farthest removed from him—and he always had bitter enemies—put their trust in him and told him so.

In his government he was Dictator, for it was largely a 'who-who' ministry. His policy was to get more out of the Allies, to turn the screws incessantly, to support the front and to crush *défaitistes* at home. This he did with the scientific vigour of one combating an epidemic. The picturesque and vicious Bolo Pacha was shot with short shrift. The *Bonnet Rouge* printed no more treason, Malvy was got rid of. Cailaux was brought to book as a malefactor, not as a politician of a rival school. (If Lord Lansdowne had been French he would presumably have been incarcerated.) All this was very much like the captain of a ship suppressing a mutiny at the point of the pistol. Speeches none—only messages when needed and then "Je fais la guerre." At the worst disaster he only growled to the Chamber "Ça tient toujours." But at the front where he prowled about incessantly he became a legend, and always he showed that among the soldiers he felt

himself really in the heart of the nation. "Bon jour, messieurs," he said to all and sundry as in gaiters, mackintosh and a shabby hat, which also became a legend, he plunged into trenches and dugouts.

Thus Clemenceau stumbled and snapped his way through the war, but what strain there must have been through the dark days of 1918! Lloyd George in a corresponding position found relief in a feverish activity and in volubility, sending Cabinet Ministers running like office boys, himself *splendide mendax*, one might say, in the House. But Clemenceau was silent or almost so, like the coxswain of a lifeboat, his hands on the lines, his gaze fixed ahead in the depth of the storm. No sign of alarm, of anxiety must escape him, for it would be destruction of hope, of life in the nation.⁹ Thus his presence, his spirit dominated the scene. He refused all talk of questioning or censuring. They were now in the supreme moment one with the soldiers and the nation and he was one with them. And so the rugged semi-Tartar features of this old high priest of the cult of country were set and faithful and composed as those of the legendary Ste. Geneviève, who when the Hun was at the gate watched over sleeping Paris. This is why he has his sure place enshrined in the inner Pantheon of French hearts.

In strictly military affairs he did not interfere, confining himself to the politico-military side. Among the generals he seemed most drawn to the able and taciturn Pétain, but he equally recognized Pétain's limitations. To him must be given much of the credit for getting Foch made generalissimo, although one can recognize between the two a real incompatibility of temperament. Foch had the qualities of a great imaginative mind including a marked sense of the dramatic. His words at times are the boldest images, and, words failing,

⁹He after admitted to a friend that he could see in 1918 nothing but a German triumph until mid-July of that year.

he was wont to fall back on a wealth of gesture and even pantomime. The literal-minded Clemenceau must have been somewhat taken aback at these demonstrations, wondering perhaps whether he had to do with a mountebank. Their real tussle was to come during the Armistice.¹⁰

The Tiger, it would seem, showed his fangs not infrequently to his Allies and Associates. He was firm that Britain should pull its weight on the Western Front. The actual extension of the British lines which led to the March catastrophe was in a way due to the fact that Clemenceau insisted on sending home certain classes of Frenchmen over fifty. It is a pity he did not remain a permanent Commissioner on a Board of Inter-Allied Indebtedness. Certainly if he had his way the United States would be faced with a claim for arrears in her contributions to the war.

The history of his relations with Lloyd George when fully known will be interesting reading. He would seem also to have had sharp passages with General Pershing, and undoubtedly he thereby spared many thousand American lives. Most piquant was his attitude to President Poincaré, who sent regularly to Clemenceau as Premier his views on the course of events and the most appropriate procedure. Clemenceau duly acknowledged them and stuffed them unread into his pockets.

Perhaps unadvisedly Clemenceau took the Chair at the Peace Conference (Poincaré was of opinion that it should be left to the Diplomats). The other allied and associated leaders also attended in person, and thus arose the famous Versailles Triangle (C.-W.-L.G.) constantly changing its apex as each pair aligned themselves against the third. We have heard the

¹⁰Some of Foch's alleged double-dealing may be accounted for by this artistic streak. He would leave no stone unturned if he could make it a stepping stone in his career just as he left no way unexplored that might lead to victory. The matter is dealt with further in commenting on that painful dialogue across the tomb which was the last exchange between these two great Frenchmen.

story endlessly from all sides. It is somewhat a novelty to get Clemenceau's own view. Strangely enough he seemed to remain satisfied with the Treaty of Versailles. It is for him a compromise between different views but it is a treaty which made a *Europe de droit*. So he interprets the application made of "self-determination." The only fault is with the heirs to the treaty, succeeding leaders of the Allies who have whittled away its advantages, pretended or believed that there was any change of heart in the Germans. Economic criticism he brushes aside or remains at this primitive point: "Germany is being let off at our expense." Hence his scorn for those who have thrown away the fruits of victory, most of all Briand, but even Poincaré does not get a clean bill of health; hence also his indignation against Lloyd George whom he reproaches with having been since November, 1918, the most determined opponent of France.¹¹ But the supreme issue was the question of the Rhine. Clemenceau was at first an advocate of the strategic frontier claimed by Foch, but he saw plainly the difficulties of making it more than provisional. Both Lloyd George and Balfour were for fixing the time limit at two years. It was Wilson who averted an open breach over the question. It was then that Lloyd George by one of those rapid 'morning-after' thoughts proposed the Joint Guarantee of France's fruits of victory. When this was lost by the Senate's repudiation of the Treaty, Clemenceau could only ingeminate against the Punic faith of the United States. The lost pact entailed his own defeat and retirement from office.

Of the rapier wit, the claw and fang work by which the Tiger gained a part of his will in the Treaty, we have a touch here and there in his last work. He does not leave Keynes (de l'ineffable groupe des mécontents)¹² to make all the portraits. Thus we have Colonel House described as "a most

¹¹For which he finds confirmation in a sally of Lloyd George's, "Well, that's going back to tradition."

¹²*Grandeurs et Misères d'une victoire*, p. 126.

urbane gentleman from the wilds of Texas, who saw through everything and took everything in and then, taking his own line, managed to get everyone to pay attention to what he had to say," while Lord Robert Cecil is "a real Christian believing in and wishing to live up to his faith but grinning like a Chinese dragon to express an obstinacy deaf to all argument." Then we have Balfour hit off as the most cultivated and kindly and courteous of men who won't budge an inch, and finally a kindred spirit to himself, "Mr. Hughes, the noble delegate from Australia, with whom one had to talk through a microphone, which however, emitted whole concerts of good sense." Once at the end of a piece of balancing dialectic from Balfour, Clemenceau fixed the oracle of philosophic doubt by "alors, vous êtes pour ou contre?" He slept or affected to sleep through Lloyd George's impassioned speeches, but at other times Wilson had to interpose himself bodily between the Tiger and this other *Bréton brétonnant* with a "Well, well, I never saw two such unreasonable creatures." Finally we have—

"J'étais là. Mes yeux ont rencontré des yeux amis. Mes mains ont touché des mains fraternelles. J'ai espéré, j'ai voulu, j'ai même agi quelquefois, sous le feu croisé des propos, avec un soldat insubordonné à mes troupes, un Président de la République qui m'aurait voulu voir au fond d'un puits, dans la rumeur du Parlement qui déjà donnait tumultueusement de la voix comme la meute quand la bête est à l'eau.

Cependant, tous les délégués de tous les pays de me prendre à part pour à tour pour m'exposer leur thèse particulière et me donner clairement à entendre que j'étais le dernier des humains, si je me permettais une objection. Et chacun de nous subissait la "performance" de son voisin jusqu'à l'épuisement de la série . . . tandis qu'à la Chambre mes adversaires qui n'avaient abouti qu'à rater la guerre, se mettait en devoir, quoi que je fisse, d'établir que j'avais raté la paix.¹³

There is *malice* here and wit and alertness at times, but there is a cynical and unfortunate pessimism, the weariness of an old man, an impatience and lack of comprehension of the adversaries' case, with the result that there is never a true compromise, but only a bargain struck on terms. One is struck with the fact that Clemenceau finds the most kindred

¹³*Grandeurs et Misères d'une victoire*, p. 135-6.

spirit in Hughes of Australia (whom he prefers infinitely to Smuts). But that one who in so many asides in this book and so often in *Au soir de ma pensée* shows that he really possesses that rich and rare thing, French culture; that there should have been associated with it a growling nationalism à la Maxse was undoubtedly a grave loss and detriment to Europe.

He felt it keenly that France refused him the Presidency; and indeed it was an ungenerous gesture. He went to India and shot a real tiger; he wrote enormously—a confessional work on Demosthenes—not ill chosen the theme, nor too well either. Demosthenes was the patriot statesman of an Athens going down before lesser breeds. Did Clemenceau think he was the last of an old régime and the new France a poorer place than the old? But it was natural that his thoughts should have centred on one of the great turning points in history. It is strange that we who have lived in the shadow of these great events have realized their significance only in a most inadequate manner. Once it was over even the civilian betrayed some of the soldier's desire to "Forget it." Yet what issues were at stake! Who can question that if Germany had won we in Canada should now be either a part or a protégé of the United States? What would Mittel-Europa have been? Britain would have fought and lost its Punic War. And France? In spite of the mistakes of the Versailles treaty Germany lives and breathes, essentially Deutschland still. There are no harps hung up by Babylon waters. If in this time of the breaking of nations the die had been cast against France, if she were reduced suddenly to the rank of Spain with Belgium and Flanders alike in the Teutonic zone, then indeed would have been enacted one of those heart-rending tragedies of history comparable only to the day when the light of Hellas went out for ever. We must give credit where it is due and if France was able to fight on to the last, it was Clemenceau who rallied her sinking courage and brought her back to her

real self. There are few figures in history who occupy a prouder place than Père La Victoire.

I have already called attention to the fact that it was two Bretons who saved the state against the Teutonic horde. And yet is it right to call Clemenceau a Celt? His younger portraits show him as the slim upright alert type of Frenchman, such another I imagine as Déroulède or Rochefort — or Armand Lavergne. But age seems to reveal the essential man underneath. He speculated as to whether he were of Chinese origin—he need not have gone farther than the Tartar! In fact we can, I think, call him the *type paysan*, primitive and eternal, the type that through centuries has won and held its conquest—the land. Hence his return to his native heath, his house and garden looking o'er the sea. There he sat him down at his shady table (with an enormous ink-pot holding a quart) to write his last testament. There he held those last communings from which issued the expression of his philosophy of Myself—Man—the Universe—the Beyond, in which though at moments he has laid aside his hatred of the Boche, he retains his scorn of le clericalisme.¹⁴ There as at times he refers to the evening sky over the sea with its suggestion of Infinity, so one can picture him in his garden gazing over the fuchsia hedge at the corn flowers on the downs beyond, talking with some privileged neighbour, another vigorous old peasant with his own struggles and triumphs now behind him. Such a one passing from a reminiscence of a marsh he had tamed and cultivated might compliment the ex-Premier on a like triumph over the Boche.

* * * * *

It is rare to attack the dead, but it is rare also that the dead continue their feuds beyond the tomb. Field-Marshal Foch before his death had apparently left instructions to pub-

¹⁴See *Au soir de ma pensée*, passim. Yet he was nursed finally by a Sister in Religion whose company he enjoyed. Cyrano!

lish a justification of his opposition to the Peace Treaty as Clemenceau had shaped and formed it. One remembers still the jarring note created by Foch when at his own demand he appeared before the Big Four of the Peace Treaty. He claimed as a soldier, as Maréchal de France, the right to declare that the sole security of France was a frontier on the Rhine. This—with its concomitant, a neutralized or autonomous Rhineland—was his alternative to the joint Guarantee of France by Britain and the United States.¹⁵ This is the major issue in Foch's Memorial, coupled with the general contention that Clemenceau was unfair to Foch, prejudiced against him and did not give him a square deal. If Foch thought for one moment that The Tiger would under the circumstances hesitate about answering the dead, he did not know his Clemenceau. The latter in fact faced the issue squarely. "You counted I would be dead before you," he says, "and not able to answer, Monsieur le Maréchal. That's not acting like a soldier." This said, he takes up impassively the *querelle d'outré tombe*.

The reason is not far to seek. Clemenceau considers that the ghostly weapon aimed at him was directed by Poincaré, who was also for annexation, who felt hurt in being left out of discussions in which Wilson was involved, and who said the Peace should have been in the hands of diplomats. Clemenceau parries and returns Foch's blows. He has only a casual and contemptuous rip for Poincaré. *Grandeurs et Misères d'une Victoire*¹⁶ gives a portrait of Foch unveiled and yet the book is impartial enough and self-revealing enough to show that there was right and wrong on both sides.

The Tiger makes clear that he was fair and even generous to Foch. He also makes equally clear that the General had

¹⁵A guarantee which the latter of course repudiated, and which we may consider to be replaced by the Pact of Locarno.

¹⁶We are left to draw our own conclusions as to the significance of this parody of Balzac's title, *Grandeurs et Misères des vies des Courtisanes*.

some of that feline quality which we find in our Repingtons and our Wilsons. Foch in fact might claim to figure in the Peace discussions, for he had proved himself a diplomat and knew something of that strategy of intrigue which went on behind the backs of Asquith, of Jellicoe and of many others.

But first of all as to the High Command. Clemenceau makes it plain that when the matter was discussed there was only one name mentioned—that of Foch. His conduct at the Marne and on the Yser had revealed him as possessing qualities which, even without an appropriate rank or position, made him take control of a situation and by a happy audacity win triumph from defeat. At Doullens, says Clemenceau, “Foch sans la permission de personne s’imposa pour le commandement.” But how? It was as at Ypres with General French; he turns up, he is confident, optimistic, cheerful when others are pessimistic, down-hearted and ready to quarrel with one another.

“Une rumeur approche, Foch arrive, entouré d’officiers, et de sa voix coupante, dominant tout: “Vous ne vous battez pas? Moi je me battrais sans m’arrêter. Je me battrais devant Amiens. Je me battrais tout le temps.” No need to comment on that, says the Tiger. “I could have thrown myself into his arms.” And in justice to Clemenceau be it said he never quite forgets that high moment.

There is of course a reverse to the medal. Very comic and not a little depressing is the scene where Clemenceau is made the recipient of one of the twenty busts in terra-cotta which Foch had had executed of himself in the height of a terrible campaign. Very illuminating is the admission of Clemenceau that, receiving a letter from Monsieur le Président de La République and knowing it to be in disagreement with his opinions, he scribbled on its envelope “Vu” and thrust it unopened into a filing cabinet.¹⁷ Very significant, too, is the

¹⁷I am not sure this is not a dignified name for an overcoat pocket!

suggestion which Foch receives from Poincaré and passes on to Clemenceau, that as the former is Commander of the Allied Forces he is responsible only to the Allied governments—to which Clemenceau's rejoinder is *impayable*.¹⁸

Finally—and it seems that this is the decisive point—when Foch lost his first round with the Germans—at the Chemin des Dames—so that the French were once more flung back to the Aisne and then the Marne, when naturally every yellow rag and every noisy politician was shouting for Foch's head, Clemenceau in full Chamber met and answered every attack, declared that Foch and the other generals were worthy of full confidence and so by his own tranquil steadfastness reassured and won over the House. Could he not say to Foch in all honesty—as he does—“Où étiez vous sans moi?”

Yet while paying full tribute to Foch not only for his great strategic gifts but for his triumphant interpositions, his contemptuous breaking down of red tape, the precious gift of his invincible confidence, he allows himself to make this point—in which Haig's supporters would perhaps agree with him—that it is by no means certain that the final triumph was Foch's work as Austerlitz was Napoleon's, or 1870 was Moltke's, and he expresses at times impatience with Foch's slowness to command, when he had been made commander and his preference for coaxing instead of ordering.

But surely we can leave this old Cato and this brilliant Scipio with their respective laurels. Their names will remain for what they did in their day. Their human foibles will but add reality to their personalities. Clemenceau can carry to his tomb his conviction that the Peace was a Peace of Right, and Foch, his conviction that he ranks with Napoleon. They have eternity to fight the matter out.

¹⁸“Do you know,” said the Marshal to me one day, that I am not your subordinate?” “No, I don't know it,” I said, laughing, and I don't want to know where you got such a notion. You know my friendship for you. Well I advise you most emphatically not to put that idea into practice for it just won't go.”

CURRENT EVENTS

THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN CANADA

With the election of a Conservative government last July, public interest in Federal politics has grown apace. Mr. Bennett, himself a "big business" man, made "hard times" the dominant issue of the campaign and promised, if elected, to restore prosperity in the immediate future. From scores of platforms he stated positively that it was no excuse for Liberal ministers to say this country was in the grip of a world-wide depression. He contended that Canada, being a young and rapidly growing country, is immune, largely, from world cycles; that "hard times" were the direct consequence of unwise fiscal policy. He promised first to relieve and later on to banish unemployment; to stimulate domestic industry, to find immediate markets for our surplus products—such as wheat and livestock. This, roughly, is the task he set himself and his success at the polls indicated that the people, as a whole, had confidence in his ability to achieve it.

In his first few months of office Mr. Bennett has proved that he did not make these promises lightly. He has given the country more action than even his most ardent supporters deemed possible; he has gone about his task with an utter disregard of precedent, or political consequences. He has thrown policies of long standing into the discard, just as one would cast aside a worn out garment. Not once has he indicated the slightest doubt of their success. Where unable, through lack of time, to formulate policies to carry out some of his pre-election promises—such as the marketing of surplus products—he has freely renewed his pledges, evinced no desire to water them down or shirk them altogether.

Mr. Bennett took office early in August. His cabinet, while

by no means an assembly of all the talents, was of average ability. Perhaps the outstanding distinction of the cabinet is the fact—without precedent—that Mr. Bennett retained three key portfolios, Prime Minister, Secretary of State for External Affairs, and Minister of Finance. In doing so he exposed himself to the criticism—if it be such—of having created a “one man” government, but so great is his prestige within the party that the charge is welcomed. Few Conservatives in the capital dispute the present dominant position of Mr. Bennett: few would have it otherwise.

The new Ministry got down to work immediately. Decisions, orders-in-council, flowed from it ceaselessly. Whereas under Mackenzie King the cabinet usually met one or two afternoons a week, the new government held cabinet every day, beginning at 10.30 a.m., continuing in the afternoon and on to a late hour at night. Not even in war time has Ottawa seen such unflagging industry. The Tariff Advisory Board was abolished, dump duties were imposed on fruits and vegetables and other natural products.

A special session of Parliament was called on September 8, and Mr. Bennett met the Commons with a clear-cut programme to relieve unemployment. This programme falls naturally into three divisions. There was the policy of direct unemployment relief, and two tariff measures of supreme importance—three legislative enactments in all. They may best be summarized in the order named.

Immediately after taking office the government made a survey of unemployment. The result was to fix the number of unemployed at approximately 117,000, divided as follows:—British Columbia, 7,692; Alberta, 5,155; Saskatchewan, 5,276; Manitoba, 6,950; Ontario, 49,367; Quebec, 41,190; New Brunswick, 500; Nova Scotia, 1,800. It was expected that this total would rise to 177,000 during the winter.

To meet this situation Mr. Bennett asked Parliament to

vote a lump sum of \$20,000,000. Parliament did so. Regulations governing the expenditure of the money were framed and ratified by order-in-council. In a broad way the Federal government held that unemployment primarily is a municipal responsibility. Where a municipality is unable to cope with a situation the province must assist. Only in a national crisis does the Federal government admit responsibility. The government admitted the "national crisis" in the present case and offered assistance under these terms:—

Payment of one-third of the cost of direct relief, the province and the municipality each to bear one-third.

Payment of twenty-five per cent. of the cost of municipal works built as a means of providing employment, the province to pay 25 per cent. and the municipality 50 per cent.

Payment of 50 per cent. of the cost of provincial public works.

The \$20,000,000 was divided into four parts:—

1. Direct unemployment relief, \$4,000,000.
2. Payment of interest charges on capital expenditures undertaken by the railways in advance of necessity, \$1,500,000.
3. Contribution to the Federal grade separation fund, administered by the Railway Commission, \$1,000,000.
4. Assistance to provincial and municipal public works, \$13,500,000.

The payment of interest charges on expenditures by the railways was decided upon to assist the transportation companies in bearing their share of the cost of subways. Ordinarily the railways plead for delay in going on with these projects on the ground of expense. By paying the interest charges on the capital investment for a year or two, this difficulty has been surmounted. It is estimated that the capital outlays to be made by the railways in advance of actual necessity will approach \$15,000,000.

The contribution of \$1,000,000 to the grade separation

fund also is of importance. This fund was begun many years ago. Parliament decided to encourage the building of subways and built up a fund by annual votes of money. The fund was placed under the control of the Railway Commission—the body that allocates costs between the municipalities and the railways. The Commission was authorized to draw on the fund in any case where a subway was urgently needed but the municipality lacked money to pay its share. In recent years the demands have exhausted the fund, hence the need of a further Federal contribution at this time.

The sum of \$13,500,000 was allocated to the provinces on a per capita basis and each provincial government was invited to survey its needs, come to Ottawa and go over details of expenditure. During these discussions it was agreed that the strict letter of the regulations should be relaxed in the case of municipalities financially embarrassed. In such cases the Federal and Provincial contributions may be increased to 80 per cent. of the total cost of any public work. But in the main the provinces accepted the regulations and a huge building programme is now under way. Taking into consideration the contributions of the provinces and the municipalities, the total expenditures will exceed greatly the sum of \$20,000,000 voted by Parliament. In fact it is estimated that nearly \$90,000,000 will be spent. This sum is made up in the following manner: direct relief, \$12,000,000; railway expenditures, \$15,000,000; Federal, Provincial and Municipal contributions to subways, \$5,000,000; public works, \$54,000,000.

From the political point of view, the government's policy was not directly challenged. As originally introduced, the legislation fixed no time limit to the expenditure of the \$20,000,000. Mr. Bennett, however, agreed that all unexpended balances (not ear-marked for some particular public work) shall lapse on March 31 next. In other words, if the unemployment condition persists throughout 1931-32, the govern-

ment will have to recognize it by asking Parliament for another grant of money.

Mr. Bennett, as Minister of Finance, lost no time in bringing forward the new fiscal policies and the two tariff measures stand out as the major achievement of the special session. He came to the Commons as the apostle of a new creed of protection; advanced a policy without precedent in this country or elsewhere. His policy, briefly, is to hand over the domestic market intact to our own manufacturers upon the distinct understanding that consumers' prices will not be increased. The penalty of increased retail prices is the withdrawal of the duties. In applying this policy only one yard stick of tariff measurement is required. The height of the tariff is of no importance, provided it prohibits imports. Mr. Bennett raised duties not by ten or twenty per cent. but by a hundred and, in some cases by thousands of per cent. When confronted by criticisms of the degree of tariff increase his answer was always the same—that the amount of protection did not matter if consumers' prices were not enhanced.

The first tariff bill had to do with the anti-dumping section of the Customs Act. This section, apart from one modification in 1922, had not been changed since 1907. It worked in this way:—if goods were imported into Canada at a price lower than the fair market value in the country of origin, a special, or dumping duty was imposed; the maximum amount of such duty was 15 per cent on the imported value, but only as much of this was imposed as might be necessary to raise the imported value up to the fair market value in the country of origin. Once the two values were equalized the ordinary rate of duty was applied.

In 1922 the Liberals made a radical change in the dumping law by creating a special class of goods—natural products—upon which the government was authorized to fix arbitrary values for duty purposes. In other words, the import value

might be ignored, also the fair market value in the country of origin. The Liberals used this legislation to place high duties on fruits and vegetables entering Canada from the United States, but such was the outcry from the low tariff wing of the party that these duties were repealed, and the legislation of 1922 was allowed to remain a dead letter on the statute books.

Hon. E. B. Ryckman, Minister of National Revenue, acting doubtless in close concert with Mr. Bennett, brought down legislation applying the principle of the 1922 legislation to the whole tariff. Whereas the government had been restricted to natural products in the fixing of arbitrary values, it was now to have a free hand to deal with any kind of goods. Mr. Ryckman said the government proposed to ignore the fair market value of goods in foreign countries and to fix arbitrary values wherever foreign competition was considered to be unfair to Canadian manufacturers. The rate of the dumping duty was increased from 15 to 50 per cent and its operation was not to be restricted in the future, as in the past, to articles upon which the tariff act imposes a duty. Goods entering Canada on the free list might be liable to this penalty.

No more far-reaching change in Canadian law could be imagined. In the future there is to be no statutory provision governing the operation of the dumping duty. Even the act of dumping is no longer defined. The imposition of dump duties is left entirely to the discretion of the cabinet; the executive now has power to change the whole tariff by the stroke of a pen without consulting Parliament.

It may be doubted if Mr. Bennett, despite his parliamentary majority, could have forced legislation of this character through the House of Commons at a regular session. The Opposition groups—Liberals, U. F. A., Labourites and Independents—were unanimous in opposing the principle. They fought for what they considered the inherent right of Parliament to fix tariff duties; fought to maintain the power

of Parliament as opposed to the power of the executive. Only the fact that a fight to the finish would have prevented Mr. Bennett from attending the Imperial Conference enabled the government to carry the legislation. The question, however, will not rest there, but will be revived next year when Parliament reassembles.

The second tariff measure was an amendment to the tariff raising the duties on some 130 articles, chiefly iron and steel products including agricultural implements, boots and shoes, glass, textiles, paper, gasolene, electric appliances and cooking utensils, and a few food-stuffs. Mr. Bennett increased the duty on these items to a point where imports practically will be prohibited and in most cases he read into the Hansard record the pledge of the various manufacturers that consumers' prices will not be enhanced.

The tariff revision affects about \$400,000,000 of imports and it is expected that at least \$200,000,000 of this trade will be cut off. The loss will be felt chiefly by Great Britain and the United States. British textile manufacturers will be hard hit and, according to reliable estimates, will lose about \$30,000,000 of Canadian business. The United States will suffer chiefly in the trade in agricultural implements. There would be no object in giving details of the new tariff. In every case the new duties have been framed to end importation.

In the maintenance of existing prices, the government has experienced difficulty but has acted with firmness. Incipient outbreaks here and there along the industrial front in the direction of higher prices have been quelled by threats of removal of the tariff. One glaring case of price increase—on glass—has resulted in cancellation of the duties. The details of the glass controversy between the glass importers and manufacturers and the government will indicate the whole trend of tariff policy.

Mr. Bennett found the duty on glass at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent British Preference; $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent Intermediate; $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent General Tariff. He raised this duty to $3\frac{1}{4}$ cents per lb. British Preference; $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents Intermediate; $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents General tariff. Glass is sold in boxes weighing 110 lbs.; worth, prior to the tariff increase, \$4.50 per box wholesale. There is no glass manufactured in Canada; none is imported from the British Empire. Our glass comes from Belgium and the rate of duty was fixed by the Intermediate tariff. This duty at $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent was 56 cents per box. The new duty at $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per lb. was \$4.92 per box—more than the sale value of the glass itself.

The Libby-Owens Glass Company of Hamilton, Ont., a subsidiary of the United States company of that name, built a plant in Hamilton years ago, but never operated it. The high tariff was designed to enable this plant to operate and serve the Canadian market, thus preventing price increase. The glass trade immediately advanced their price to the extent of the duty. The government at Ottawa objected and, the trade remaining obdurate, the new duties were revoked.

In this instance again the enactment of a highly controversial measure was facilitated by the nearness of the Imperial Conference. While the Opposition permitted the new tariff to become law it was distinctly understood that the tariff question, including the increases of the special session, will be reopened when Parliament reassembles. Mr. Bennett has announced he will complete the upward revision of the remaining 800 or more items of the Tariff Act, so that next year will witness the opening of a new chapter in political controversy on fiscal policy.

It is, perhaps, too early to gauge the effect on domestic politics of Mr. Bennett's performance in London. Throughout the Conference, with one exception, the Liberal party refrained from challenging Mr. Bennett's scheme of Empire Preferences. But it is well known that Mr. Mackenzie King

and his lieutenants disapprove strongly both of Mr. Bennett's policy and his method of advocating it. A ten per cent British Preference, in their view, would not open Canada's market to British goods, but would give the British market for food-stuffs to Empire producers—largely to Canada. The proposal in their view is too one-sided, too selfish, to be acceptable in Great Britain. They believe Mr. Bennett will permanently injure Canada's standing in a market of first importance to western Canada and that he should have offered a fair exchange of goods. Mr. King remained silent because he did not believe it was in the public interest to embarrass Mr. Bennett, while the Conference was in session. If, however, Mr. Bennett's proposal fails to attract the British government, as now seems certain, Mr. King will make the question of Imperial trade a major issue in Federal politics.

On the whole, the public reaction to the Bennett tariff has not been favourable or unfavourable. While manufacturers have hailed it with enthusiasm the organs of western opinion have been highly critical. But the man on the street appears to have reserved judgment until the effects are clear. Those who know Mr. Bennett best are confident that he will compel manufacturers to keep down prices. The question which remains unanswered is how Canada can sell surplus products in the world if she is not willing to accept goods in return. Mr. Bennett, as far as his public utterances go, has no doubts on this point. He does not believe that prohibition of imports will curtail exports and penalize wheat growers and livestock farmers. Time alone will determine whether his confidence is justified.

GRANT DEXTER.

THE BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION AT WINNIPEG

The ninety-eighth Annual Meeting of the British Medical Association, which took place at Winnipeg from August 26th

to 29th, was an event of more than ordinary significance. Only three times during its long existence has this great Association met outside the British Isles. The first occasion was in 1897 at Montreal, when Lord Lister laid the corner-stone of the Jubilee Nurses Home at the General Hospital. Many now, after a generation, will remember the doubts and fears that assailed the medical profession of both countries until success became assured. The second visit, to Toronto in 1906, was emphasized by the participation of the elements, for a thunderstorm was staged during which a hospital was struck by lightning. The third visit was to Winnipeg in 1930, in acceptance of an invitation proffered thirty-three years before. The venture was again an undoubted success. We may hope that by this time the British Medical Association has acquired the habit of convening in Canada. On this occasion, too, the elements were not idle, for the first three days of the meeting were marked by an embarrassing heat wave. It was with not unconscious humour that some of the visitors referred publicly to the warmth of their reception!

If one were to select an adjective that would seem particularly appropriate to characterize the Winnipeg meeting that adjective would be "colourful," and this not only in a metaphorical but a literal sense. From the opening exercises, when the members were posing and imposing in their academics, until the last Tea at Lower Fort Garry, which was enlivened by the songs and dancing of Poles and Ukrainians in their gala costumes, colour ran riot. Anyone who was present at the Pageant when Lord Dawson was made a chief and saw the wonderful and indeed beautiful costumes of the Indians could appreciate Lord Moynihan's little joke when he said he thought the Indians should no longer be referred to as the "plain" Crees. The native tribes and the new Canadians added a decidedly picturesque touch to an attractive programme, and it may well be doubted whether any city in Canada could have

surpassed, or even equalled, Winnipeg in the character of the entertainment provided.

It was of much significance that on this occasion the Canadian Medical Association merged with the larger body for the purpose of scientific discussion. This was appropriate enough, for the two associations were affiliated a few years since at a ceremony which Dr. Alfred Cox, the Medical Secretary of the British Medical Association, referred to happily as a marriage with the word "obey" left out. The event has everywhere, in Canada and England been regarded as one of high moment. Not only did the medical profession as a whole rally to the support of the two Associations, but wherever they went the visitors met with distinguished courtesy from the official representatives of the Federal and Provincial Governments, the municipalities, and citizens generally. The British Medical Journal put it aptly when it said: "The visit to Canada has indeed been interpreted as possessing a note and quality of patriotism, and has been welcomed as an expression of cordiality and good feeling between peoples who share a common tradition and a common loyalty, and look with confidence also to a common future."

Epoch-making discoveries are not made every day, nor are scientific bodies often privileged to hear papers of the importance of Pasteur's "Mémoires sur la Fermentation Lactique," communicated in 1858 to the Lille Scientific Society, or Lister's "On the Antiseptic Principle in the Practice of Surgery," read before the British Medical Association in 1867. Nothing startling was announced at Winnipeg. Nevertheless, certain problems much to the fore in these days were thoroughly discussed.

The value of radium as compared with surgery in the treatment of cancer was a question so important that it was discussed in three of the Sections. Sir Charles Gordon-Watson, of London, a notable authority, opened the subject in the

Section of Surgery, and was followed by Mr. Stanford Cade, Mr. Frank Kidd, Mr. Hugh Cairns, all of London, by Dr. Douglas Quick, of New York, and Dr. G. E. Birkett, of Manchester. Mr. Sidney Forsdike of London and Dr. W. W. Chipman of Montreal discussed the use of radium in gynaecology. The discussion everywhere was conducted in a critical spirit, and emphasis was laid on the proposition that radium is not a panacea for cancer. Other ideas that emerged were that radium should be employed therapeutically only by those thoroughly instructed in its use and that it should be centralized in places where its effects could be scientifically observed and controlled. Sir Charles made a strong plea for team-work between the physician, surgeon, pathologist, physicist, and biochemist, in order that the employer of radium might do his work on a scientific rather than an empiric basis. It was evident that the speakers all felt that much more investigation was in order and more time must elapse before the value of radium in treatment could be properly assessed.

Tuberculosis, that ever-present menace to the public health, was considered in three of the Sections. Dr. C. H. Vrooman of Vancouver, in particular, referred to the great prevalence of this disease among the Indian, Japanese and Chinese populations of British Columbia. Numbering some 70,000 in a total population of 600,000, these races contribute forty per cent of the cases in that province.

Dr. Ray M. Price of Toronto advanced statistics tending to show that certain forms of tuberculosis usually attributed to bovine bacilli were becoming less frequent. She also gave information bearing on the safety or otherwise of raw milk as supplied to Toronto. Of 250 samples derived from small dairy farms only 3.7 per cent proved to be contaminated with tubercle bacilli, while, in striking contrast, 26 per cent of pooled bulk milk was found contaminated prior to pasteurization. The Toronto studies indicated that effective pasteuriza-

tion eliminated the danger from bovine tuberculosis. Dr. A. S. M. Macgregor, Medical Health Officer of Glasgow, was also convinced of the efficacy of pasteurization. Most of the speakers, including Dr. Bruce Chown, Winnipeg, Dr. J. A. Jarry, Montreal, and Dr. Lawrence, Port-of-Spain, Trinidad, agreed that the greatest danger of infection in children lay in the infected home.

The Section of Medical Sociology discussed the matter of "Migration within the Empire," important, as it is bound up with the question of the balance of races, physical fitness, and the acquirement and dissemination of disease. This topic was introduced by Dr. T. C. Routley, General Secretary of the Canadian Medical Association. Fundamentally, the problem was one of supply and demand, but yet was capable of intelligent direction. It was necessary that we secure in Canada a larger proportion of British stock to maintain the balance; the pioneer type of emigrant with robust physique was deemed most requisite. The wisdom of the dole system was questioned as tending to cause deterioration of the stock.

Sir James Barrett, of Melbourne, Australia, pointed out that migration in itself was no remedy for over-population, but proper distribution was essential. He expressed strong views on the standards adopted for emigrants, and suggested that all that was necessary was a certificate from an approved board of examiners that the emigrant was in such a physical condition that he was unlikely to become a burden on the country of his adoption. Sir James was also of the opinion that no governmental responsibility should be assumed for the new-comer after his arrival.

Dr. J. Harvey Pirie, of Johannesburg, thought that the difficulties attending the establishment of the white races in tropical South Africa were probably bound up with the natives, who were so often the reservoirs of communicable diseases of great gravity. There seemed to be justification for

the view that where there were no native races, or where the communicable diseases could be controlled, the whites might maintain an existence even in the tropics. Apart from this, the "poor white" problem was largely one of diet. The usual diet of mealies on which the poor subsisted was quite inadequate to maintain a sufficient degree of fitness.

The Section then adopted two resolutions—one favouring the establishment of an Imperial Board of Immigration, and a second, calling for a general certificate of fitness, both to be transmitted to the Council of the British Medical Association.

A misgiving sometimes arises when one contemplates these immense gatherings. Is such a large expenditure of energy, time and money justified by the results? The programme is usually crowded; it is impossible to attend more than a small number of the Sections in which one is interested; and the call of the social is often louder than that of the scientific. Measured by the yardstick of advance such conventions usually fall short, but, at least, they afford an opportunity for stock-taking, a platform from which to launch new flights. The interchange of ideas, the stimulus that comes from meeting in the flesh the great personages who have done so much to advance knowledge, the friction that generates the sparks of genius, cannot be devoid of value. And all this may come about on the ocean liner, the railway train, on the links, and at the afternoon tea as well as at the scientific session.

Those who were privileged to hear Lord Moynihan's remarks at the Annual Banquet of the Association, held at the Hudson Bay Stores, when he proposed the toast of "The Empire," will not soon forget his inspiring words. He propounded a thought about the value of our two medical associations that may have been new to some and certainly was alluring. After declaring that he regarded the ninety-eighth annual banquet of the Association as a great imperial gathering, His Lordship spoke as follows:—

"We are meeting in Canada. Stories of the origin and progress and the idea of the destiny of Canada make very high romance. It has been said that in the new age the Westminster of the world will be at Ottawa. This may be true, or it may not. It is perhaps only a figment of the imagination, but, as the poet said, 'Imagination is like Adam's dream; he awoke and found it true.' The heart of the Empire would never be at Ottawa; it would never be at Westminster; it would never be in any Australian centre, nor in Cape-town. The heart of empire is in the hearts of men. It was in the hearts of men, and not in the minds of men, that the British Empire had come to light."

"We have inherited an empire. What are we going to do to hold it? Many suggestions have been made. At the moment the great subject of discussion is, What commercial bonds can be created between the various parts of the Empire? The question is being asked whether we in England are wisely clinging to free trade as the only rock that can save us in the time of peril, or whether we are foolish in clinging to a tradition that is a delusion.

"Whether we are worshipping an effete tradition or otherwise the next few years will decide. We cannot be kept together as an empire by any power of law. The Roman empire was held together by law alone, and it is now nothing but a very honoured memory. Israel tried to keep its empire together by moral law, and the empire of Israel is gone. What is going to hold our Empire together? Let me make a suggestion—that it may be in the pursuit of science together. Science is the only quest for truth that has no partisan bias. . . .

"No empire has ever yet been securely founded, nor

will any empire ever endure, that is founded only on material things. The only empire that can ever endure is one that is founded on love and honour, truth and charity, and a sense of duty."

Perhaps, after all, it is just here, in the realization of their place in the scheme of empire, that medical conventions such as that held recently in Winnipeg find their chief justification.

ALBERT G. NICHOLLS.

THE R-101.

Not within recent years have the feelings of the British peoples been so deeply stirred as they were by the loss of the airship R-101 near Beauvais on October 5 last. The financial loss involved in the disaster is as nothing compared with the destruction of human life of priceless value. Most of the men who for many years had given of their best to bind the Empire more closely together through quicker air transport shared the fate of the great machine, the product of their own creative genius and from which they had with confidence expected vastly different achievement. The happy combination of enthusiasm, of technical skill and experience cannot be duplicated. Therein lie the most disastrous consequences of the mishap.

The Canadian people had a peculiar interest in the R-101 by reason of the visit of the sister ship, the R-100, to Canada during the late summer, an interest now tinged with pain because of the death in the disaster of several of the officers and men who brought the giant dirigible across the Atlantic. Canadians were thrilled by the spectacle of the mighty ship gliding gracefully through the air under perfect control and were prepared to accept the establishment of a regular air service with the Motherland as a probable attainment of the early future. It was obvious that the designers and officers of

the R-100 were extremely proud of their ship and of its achievement and that they approached with confidence the next phase in the evolution of a system of Imperial airways. For the present, at least, this confidence has been shaken.

The projected cruise of the R-101 to India—as also the flight of the R-100 to Canada—was part of the “Airship Programme” devised by the Imperial government in 1924 as a means for the introduction of quicker transport for passengers and mail between Britain and the Dominions. This programme, involving extensive experimental work and investigation, was considered at the Imperial Conference of 1926, when Canada agreed to install an airship base and mooring-mast. The construction of the mooring-mast at St. Hubert’s field, near Montreal, represented the initial part of Canada’s contribution to the scheme. Masts were built at Ismalia in Egypt and at Karachi in India, while plans were made for the construction of others in Australia and New Zealand, in South Africa and on the east and west coasts of Africa.

The building of the R-100 and R-101 was a central feature of this programme but represented only an intermediate stage. These ships when inflated with hydrogen possessed a gross lifting capacity of 150 long tons. It was recognized, however, that they were too small for commercial operation on a profitable financial basis because of their limited carrying capacity. On the other hand, it was deemed wise to conduct extensive experiments and to obtain practical experience of working conditions with this intermediate type of ship before embarking on the final stage involving much greater expense and, possibly, greater operating risks. The R-100 was sent to Canada and the R-101 to India as part of this experimental inquiry. The disaster, therefore, has a most significant bearing on the larger project of improved intra-Imperial communications.

Until the completion of the official inquiry, if even then,

it will not be possible to determine the causes of the mishap. It is known now that the engines were of greater weight than had been contemplated and that to provide the requisite lifting capacity it had been necessary to add another bay to the ship and install a further gas bag. The original design of the ship was, therefore, somewhat modified.

The disaster has directed attention to the risks involved in the use of hydrogen and the relative advantages of helium, a non-inflammable gas, for purposes of inflation. The only country which now possesses helium in sufficient quantities to make its use in airships feasible is the United States and the export of helium from the United States is virtually prohibited. Helium is extracted from natural gas; the helium content of certain gas wells in the United States has been found to be as high as 7.2%, whereas the maximum helium content of gas found in Canada has been less than 1%. It is conceivable that investigation may reveal more extensive stores of helium in Canada. The cost of obtaining helium varies naturally with the percentage of the helium content of the natural gas but at best is very high. Using gas possessing a helium content of 5%, which is relatively large, the cost of extraction is approximately \$15.00 a thousand cubic feet compared with .60 for the same quantity of hydrogen manufactured at Cardington.

It is impossible at this stage to foretell the influence which the mishap may have on the "Airship Programme." If it should be found that the disaster was caused by mechanical defects which can be overcome it is conceivable that the original plans may still be carried out. Certain it is, in any event, that the risks associated with the use of hydrogen gas have been demonstrated with appalling force and it is probable that there will be hesitation in embarking on more ambitious projects until methods of construction and of control of airships have been substantially improved.

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

There will probably be much controversy regarding the Imperial Conference of 1930 and the policies advocated there by the representatives of the several governments. As the end of the Conference approaches those both in Britain and in the Dominions who had hoped for the adoption of policies which might result immediately in increased intra-Imperial trade are inclined to be critical of its deliberations and pessimistic regarding the prospects of the future. We are not assured that this attitude is justified and venture the suggestion that the 1930 Conference may yet be regarded with feelings of satisfaction.

The Imperial and Economic Conferences of 1930 assembled under most unusual conditions. Not since the Imperial Conference has become an institution of importance in determining public policy has it been convened with a condition of unemployment in Britain and in the Dominions as serious as it is to-day or with industry and commerce suffering from depression as acute as exists at present. Nor are these evidences of depression limited to the British peoples; they are world-wide, although they may be felt with varying degrees of severity. When trade is depressed and producers and merchants are concerned about increasing sales it is natural to seek aid from those who belong to the same association whether it be political or social. The corner grocer regards his relatives, the members of his church or fraternal organization as under a special obligation to continue their patronage when trade is slack. Those who advocate the creation of an Empire self-contained economically find most cogent arguments during periods of trade depression. The present cycle will run its course despite the assistance of governments in speeding its way; foreign markets will be opened and the urge to increase intra-Imperial sales will decline.

All parties in Canada are agreed upon the advantage of

increasing the sale of Canadian products within the Empire; there are differences of opinion regarding the best method by which this can be obtained. Let it be admitted with perfect frankness that Canadians in approaching the problem of intra-Imperial trade are concerned with the interests of Canada first, as are the agriculturists and industrialists of Britain with the interests of Britain first. Therein lies the cause of the complexity of the situation inasmuch as the Canadian industrialist and the British industrialist may enter into keen competition not only in the Canadian market but in the foreign market as well. Britain now provides practically free access to our exports, whereas many of her exports to Canada are subject to tariff barriers designed to preserve the Canadian market as far as possible for the Canadian manufacturer. Such has been the policy of successive Canadian governments and may be taken to represent the wish of the Canadian people. The people of Britain recognize the right of Canada to protect her own industry and do not object to such a policy. It is not surprising that they should claim the same privilege for themselves and should indicate that such a system imposes definite limitations to the extension of intra-Imperial trade.

Mr. Bennett's proposal of a flat increase of 10% in the tariff against foreign products may have been too simple a treatment for a situation that bristles with complexities. As effectively, possibly, as a more intricate proposal, it raised the question of principle underlying the tariff structure regarded by the government of Britain as essential to the maintenance of British industry and trade. The MacDonald government gave the only answer possible in the circumstances unless it were to betray the principles advocated consistently by the leaders of the Labour Party. The Conference may be regarded as having cleared away much of the underbrush—as, for instance, the heresies of the Empire free-traders — which

obstructed the approach to the heart of the problem. In doing this it has performed a most valuable service.

It may be that the present government does not interpret correctly the opinion of the British people. Such an assumption cannot be made until there has been an appeal to the electorate. The fact that political parties are divided on the economic principles discussed by the Conference did not make its task less difficult. The Labour and Liberal Parties are unequivocally opposed to a tax on food and raw materials. The leadership of the Unionist Party has been uncertain and hesitant on this issue but seems to be moving in the direction of food taxes. The prime ministers of the Dominions thus found themselves playing the political game of one of the British Parties and, necessarily, at the same time arousing the opposition of the Labour and Liberal groups. While it is undesirable that suspicions should be created that one portion of the Empire is interfering in the affairs of another or attempting to dictate the policies, it is inevitable that when an issue arises involving the interests of Britain and all the Dominions there should be a certain community of opinion within allied groups throughout the Empire. In such circumstances political manners may become of more significance than reasoned arguments. In the end each community must settle the issue for itself for, as Mr. MacDonald naïvely observed, Britain has not yet ceased to be an autonomous Dominion.

The Conference may claim one solid achievement. It has come to a realization of the complexity of the problem of disturbing existing channels of trade and increasing the sale of British products in Canada and of Canadian produce in Britain. There is no special magic either in preferences or in quotas. This is not a situation which can be "muddled through" but requires much more careful and thorough consideration in specific detail than it has yet received. The decision to defer consideration of the issues to a Conference to

be held in Ottawa in the summer has much to commend it. There may be distinct advantage in meeting outside of Britain, regardless of the issue of the Conference. The adjournment will provide time for further examination of the means by which intra-Imperial trade may be extended.

It would seem that in Canada there is one obvious channel of inquiry which should be explored to the limit. If we are to expect more extensive purchases of Canadian farm products in Britain we should be prepared to offer some *quid pro quo*. There must be many types of manufactured products not made in Canada and now imported from the United States or other foreign countries which could be supplied by Britain. It is suggested that the government should institute inquiries in the several industrial groups, the steel industries, the textile industries, for instance, and that these inquiries should be conducted not by government officials but by the people actually engaged in the industry. Were it possible to gather together around a common table representatives of the Canadian steel industry, of the importers and users of steel products, of the government acting on behalf of the general public, and of the British manufacturers it is conceivable that means could be discovered for increasing the imports of British steel products without doing violence to Canadian industry and without a substantial increase in the price to the Canadian consumer. Granted on the part of the Canadian and British producers a willingness to co-operate, we believe that much can be done to improve the situation within the bounds of the present tariff structure. The co-operation of the British industrialist must, however, include a willingness to produce the type of goods required by the Canadian market and the provision, through warehouses and other facilities of merchandising, of a system of prompt deliveries. The United States has penetrated the Canadian market at the expense of Great Britain because of its more careful study of Canadian requirements and its superior mer-

chandising service. These are problems, however, which, if they are capable of solution, can be solved by the industrialists. Certain it is that any permanent extension of intra-Imperial trade must be made on the basis of the economic advantage of those who participate in it, whether it be the purchaser of Canadian grain or of British manufactured goods. The attempt to force trade in unprofitable channels merely because of sentimental associations can bring nothing but disaster to the Imperial connection. The opinions of those engaged in the trade are therefore worthy of serious consideration.

There is at present a real danger that Empire trade shall be made the tail of the politician's kite and that decisions on most important issues of marketing and business policy shall be determined by considerations of party advantage. It would be most unfortunate if such should be the case either in Britain or in Canada. This is a situation in which "no politics" may prove to be the best politics. Mr. Bennett has already demonstrated that he is not lacking in courage; his control of the present parliament is undisputed. We believe that he would earn the lasting gratitude of the Canadian people by taking the problem of Imperial trade out of the arena of party politics and by inviting the participation of industry, of labour and of agriculture in discussions looking to its solution. Much more can be accomplished by the co-operation of the representatives of industry in Britain and in Canada acting in a spirit of goodwill and with a determination to achieve positive results than is possible by the haphazard processes of legislation. The postponement of official discussions until the Conference to be convened at Ottawa in the summer gives Mr. Bennett his opportunity.

D. McA.

BOOK REVIEWS

Une Famille du Refuge, par Blanche Biéler. Editions "Je Sers," 1930, pp. 274. Burton: Montreal.

This book by Madame Biéler, wife of Professor Biéler, Montreal, is exceedingly interesting both for its substance and its style. It is true that the authoress regards it as "an act of piety," a tribute to the family to which she belongs and especially to its most distinguished member, Jean-Henri Merle D'Aubigné (1794-1872), pastor, professor, and author of the *History of the Reformation*, but the subject is set in a large background beginning with the flight of many Protestants from France owing to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685). Explanation is given how the name D'Aubigné, which came in on the female side, was associated with the Merle family. This family found in Geneva "a city of refuge"; its members traversed various parts of Europe and some of them settled on this side of the Atlantic. The volume closes with this striking statement: "In August, 1914, when the world war broke out, all the descendants of Aimé-Robert Merle D'Aubigné, except the two groups established on the American continent, had become again, for a longer or shorter time, French. The family of the Refuge, exiled on account of its faith, and grateful to Geneva for its asylum, had returned to its original home." (p. 257.)

Madame Biéler asks why the method that Galsworthy has made popular in a series of romances may not be applied to biography? We can see no reason when the resources and skill are, as in this case, available. "Note further that it is not a case of a historical romance. The documents at my disposal were so numerous that there was no need of invention. Here

and there a stroke of the pen or a touch of the brush has been used to revive a scene without compromising the truthfulness of the narrative." It is not a matter of propaganda or polemic. The story is told for its own sake, but it reminds us of what had been freely acknowledged, that France, by its treatment of the Protestants in the seventeenth century, lost many noble citizens who by their skill, industry and integrity enriched the life of other countries.

No longer could it be said in the words of Mazarin, "The little flock feeds on poor pasture but it does not wander away." The reading of the Bible, the singing of psalms, the use of schools and temples was forbidden. Those that could wander had to seek liberty elsewhere. We have here the story of the adventures of one group; they were scattered here and there but Geneva became the centre of their most important member. Naturally we learn much about that interesting city, "the city of Calvin," which, while it maintained its independence, had a changeful history. "The arrival at Geneva during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries of refugees belonging to the ruling classes of France and Italy, quickly assimilated to the notable families of the city, and at the beginning of the eighteenth century, thanks to commerce, industry and banking, had little by little destroyed in the small Republic, not only the antique simplicity of manners but also the foundations of the ancient democracy." This led to political struggle and theological discussion in which this particular group engaged. They were Puritans but not of the hard, rigid type; the influence of Rousseau and Voltaire favoured the culture of art and poetry.

The latter part of the book gives a fine sketch of J. H. Merle D'Aubigné's life. He was an able man, an outstanding figure of the evangelical circles of Europe; a great worker and a man who was in close touch with the religious leaders of his day. An American, writing of his travels, said: "At Geneva

one must see three monuments: Saint Pierre, Mont Blanc, and Merle d'Aubigné. But success is difficult. The Cathedral is often closed; the giant of the Alps hidden in the clouds and the historian of the Reformation invisible." (p. 242). If space permitted we could quote much more but this is perhaps sufficient to show that the book needs no apology but stands squarely on its own historical and literary merits.

W. G. J.

* * * * *

Johnson of the Mohawks: A Biography of Sir William Johnson, Mohawk War Chief, American Soldier, Empire Builder. By Arthur Pound, in collaboration with Richard E. Day, Litt.D., New York. The Macmillan Company, 1930.

A new biography of Sir William Johnson is welcomed by students of the New York frontier, especially a work which makes use of the abundant material which has come to light in the sixty-five years since Stone's *Life* was published. Griffis and Buell, while drawing extensively on Stone, added little that was new, and at the same time authentic. In his Preface, Mr. Pound tells us with commendable pride, that *Johnson of the Mohawks* rests on a foundation built by Dr. Day during almost twenty-five years' research, while State Historian of New York. As compiler of the Calendar of the Johnson papers, Dr. Day made a contribution to history which has proved unusually valuable, for it now affords the only clue to the content of many of the manuscripts destroyed in the fire in the State Capitol in 1911. Steeped in the Johnson tradition, he must be considered the foremost authority on the subject, and we are justified in expecting from his collaborator a work of first rate importance.

Mr. Pound has, however, given us a book which we read with mingled feelings of pleasure and of disappointment. So far as the public life of Sir William is concerned, there is

recognition of that factual accuracy of which the publishers boast in their advertisement, and of the breadth of knowledge that has made this possible. Our quarrel lies, not with the material, but with the way it has been used. Unfortunately, the mantle of Dr. Day, the scientific historian, has not fallen upon the shoulders of Mr. Pound, the popular journalist, and it is deeply to be regretted that, in his efforts to write a "best-seller" the writer has marred what is, in most respects, an admirable work. His flippant style and evident striving after sensationalism, especially in the earlier chapters, seem highly incongruous, wedded to the scholarship of his collaborator. Not only that, but his flippancy frequently conveys a wrong impression. On the second page, speaking of the Mohawks, he says: "Even the Mississippi occasionally echoed the whoopee of their young men out to see the world and to taste literally the delights of slaughter;" and again, in Chapter VII: "If he chose, he could regale himself on raw enemy." Mr. Pound is, of course, trying to be funny, but at the same time he is doing a grave injustice to that once proud race of which he has apparently little sympathetic understanding. Occasionally at an early period an enemy who had shown unusual bravery in battle or under torture was eaten as a doubtful compliment to his fortitude, the warriors believing that by this means his brave spirit became part and parcel of their own. The Mohawks had given up the practice long before Sir William Johnson settled in the Mohawk Valley. "Raw enemy" was never a regular item on the menu of the Iroquois, as Mr. Pound would have us believe.

A still greater defect is the attitude he sees fit to assume in the treatment of Sir William's private life, taking delight in continually drawing our attention to the fact that it was irregular, to say the least. He scores Buell for glossing over the facts, and misses no opportunity to keep these matters in the foreground. Indeed, he twists and colours them to make

the picture as salacious as possible. Johnson did not buy a wife: he bought her indentures, and, while there is no proof that the marriage took place immediately afterwards, there is also no proof that it was postponed until Catherine Weisenberg lay on her death-bed. Pound, however, persists in forcing the legend upon us, painting a picture of the scene which is purely imaginary, as he confesses, yet thereafter treating this fiction as a fact.

The chapter on "Johnson and His Children" leaves much to be desired. Aside from a mere mention of Peter, Molly Brant's children have not been considered. We forgive Stone for ignoring them, for he did his best to ignore their mother, but Mr. Pound has no such excuse. He insisted on dragging them into the limelight; in justice to Sir William, the least he could have done was to point out that they were by no means unworthy children of a great man. The Canadian Archives at Ottawa contain ample proof that at least five of the six daughters married influential white men: that Peter was a lieutenant in the 26th when killed in the campaign on Long Island: and that George fought at Brock's side on Queenston Heights.

The book is a disappointment, then, to the serious student. The average reader will find it entertaining but will receive a wrong impression of certain phases of the life and times of Sir William Johnson. It is a matter of deep regret that Dr. Day could not have given the world a biography from his own pen.

C. B. F.

* * * * *

Select Documents in Canadian Economic History, 1497-1783;
edited by H. A. Innis, Ph.D., Associate Professor of
Political Economy, University of Toronto. Toronto:
The University of Toronto Press. 1929. ix+581 pp.

In the preparation of this volume Professor Innis has

undertaken an extremely difficult task but has performed it with singular success. There is such a wealth of source materials relating to the economic history of New France and Acadia that an adequate selection can be made only with great difficulty. The editor has divided the documents into two main groups, the first including those relating to the fishing industry, and the second those relating to the fur trade. In both cases, however, a wide selection is made illustrating the various forms of economic interest associated with the fisheries and with the fur trade.

In the first part emphasis is laid properly on the development of Nova Scotia, Cape Breton and Prince Edward Island. Documents are provided indicating the character of the population, the condition of the health of the community, the development of agriculture, of industry, of transportation and of trade, particularly with New England. The sources employed are chiefly contemporary memoirs and descriptions and the correspondence and reports found in the official correspondence in the Canadian Archives.

The second part relating more particularly to New France covers an equally wide range of interest. Documents illustrating the course of immigration, the progress of agriculture, of the timber trade and of ship-building, of internal and external trade are to be found here. The letters of Marie de L'Incarnation, the *Relations* of the Jesuits, such descriptions as those given by Pierre Boucher supplement the materials derived from the official correspondence of the French Régime.

The volume will place before the student of Canadian history much valuable and interesting material to which he has not hitherto had access.

* * * * *

The Fuel Problem of Canada. By Martin Nordegg. Toronto:
The Macmillan Company of Canada. 1930. Pp. 136.

"Canada is the second largest coal importing country of

the world—and yet she possesses 17 per cent of the coal resources of the entire world. . . . The fundamental features for an independent supply are existing. The main handicap still is the long distance from the mines to the markets, resulting in an intense competition with foreign supplies. Apparently the industry has been unable or has made no attempt to overcome by its own efforts the present serious hindrance.”

Such, briefly, is the situation depicted in this stimulating and provocative book which could be read with profit by all consumers of coal in Canada. The author by reason of technical training and actual observation of the operation of the mines of Canada is thoroughly competent to discuss the subject.

After surveying the coal areas of Canada Mr. Nordegg discusses the action taken by governments, federal and provincial, with respect to the coal-mining industry. He then considers methods of coal production and is extremely critical of the uneconomic methods employed in many of our mines, the Alberta coal fields in particular. Of special interest is his treatment of the marketing of coal; his conclusions are significant: “It is obvious that in this wholesale and retail distribution a great and immediate saving must be effected. Two groups of middlemen are making profits which can hardly be justified in comparing the actual price of coal at the mine with the selling and handling charges. These middlemen, as shown, are making exceedingly high profits, or else they would not stay in business. The elimination of these profits would and should directly and immediately benefit the consumer, and thus reduce the price of Canadian coal to the extent of materially reducing the consumption of foreign coal.”

Mr. Nordegg does not leave his reader without constructive suggestions for the solution of the fuel problem. He advocates the reorganization of the mining industry on an economical basis, the closing of certain mines and the amalga-

mation of others to the end that costs of production may be reduced, and the formation of Coal Syndicates, or machinery for co-operative marketing, which will eliminate much of the cost now paid to the middleman. From beginning to end the book is thoroughly stimulating.

* * * * *

Emigration from the British Isles, with special reference to the development of the overseas Dominions. By W. A. Carrothers. London: P. S. King & Son, Ltd. 1929. Pp. ix+328.

The Central European Immigrant in Canada. By Robert England, M.C. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada, Limited. 1929. Pp. xv+238.

The revival of interest in Canada in the problem of immigration gives a timely interest to these two volumes. Professor Carrothers was born in Ireland, where he received his elementary education. He is himself an emigrant to Canada. After graduating in Arts from the University of Manitoba he went overseas and saw service with the Canadian Infantry and the Royal Air Force. He then undertook graduate studies in the University of Edinburgh and chose the subject of emigration from the British Isles as his special field of study. He served for several years in the Department of Economics at the University of Saskatchewan and has recently joined the staff of the University of British Columbia. Professor Carrothers has thus enjoyed special facilities for the study of immigration.

The historical method of treatment is followed throughout the study. The first chapter gives a brief but adequate survey of early migrations to British North America, from the first settlements in Nova Scotia to the Selkirk migration. After dealing similarly with the early settlement of Australia, the author discusses Malthusianism and Emigration and then devotes three excellent chapters to a study of the Wakefield

theory of colonization in its practical application to the settlement of Australia and New Zealand. These chapters alone justify the publication of the book. We are again brought back to Canada in a consideration of migration from 1820 to the Durham period and the attitude of Durham, with whom Wakefield was associated, to the problem of migration. Attention is then directed to the conditions prevailing in Britain near the end of the first half of the nineteenth century in their influence on overseas settlement. The volume closes with a discussion of the influence of the Great War on emigration and of the problem of migration as it exists to-day.

Several of the author's conclusions are of special interest. The history of colonization schemes gives little ground for predicting the success of colonization companies organized on commercial lines. The movement of migration to the Dominions must be restricted and the selection must be left with the Dominions. He expects that the number of available immigrants from the United Kingdom will decrease and that, in consequence, 'the Dominions will be faced with the serious problem of difficulty in securing the desired population additions from the British Isles to assist in the development of their economic resources.'

In all respects the book is a thoroughly admirable study and fills a distinct gap in the history of the settlement of the Dominion.

Mr. England's book is concerned with a different but equally significant phase of the immigration problem, the assimilation of the Central European in the life of Western Canada. The study grew out of a most interesting project fathered by the Masonic Order in Saskatchewan when it awarded fifty scholarships to teachers on the condition that they should teach for at least a year in the more backward non-English-speaking districts. In addition, they were required to make social surveys of their respective districts. Mr.

England was awarded one of these scholarships and, after spending three years in one of these immigrant districts, was awarded a scholarship by the Province of Saskatchewan which enabled him to continue in Paris his studies of the problem of assimilation. He was later appointed Continental Superintendent of the Department of Colonization of the Canadian National Railways and in that capacity enjoyed unique opportunity for the study of the Central European Immigrant in his native environment. Mr. England's book is based in part on the information gathered by the teachers under the Masonic Scholarship scheme.

The subject is treated in three sections. The first under the title of 'The Problem and the People' presents a general survey of the Central European elements in the population of Western Canada. The second, and possibly the most interesting, gives a comprehensive and penetrating survey of social and economic conditions in typical non-English districts in Saskatchewan. Mr. England concludes that "there can be little hope for complete amalgamation unless the process of education is accelerated in these non-English communities. Ignorance, poverty, and social degradation go hand in hand, and the attack must be directed mainly against ignorance. The question of the improvement of social conditions is vital, yet little can be done by word of mouth. Example and guidance are essential." For that reason the rural school is of fundamental importance. In this connection Mr. England advocates the erection of teachers' "homes" or teacherages associated with the school in each district and indicates the advantages of such an institution in providing a social, educational and moral centre of the community.

The third section discusses the psychology of assimilation and contains much solid wisdom. It is a plea for the sympathetic understanding of the continental immigrant and a willingness to appreciate the solid contributions to our civiliza-

tion that he is capable of making. "The Sermon on the Mount is not only incomparable ethics but sound national policy. Canada has a great opportunity, as the residuary legatee of British ideals of tolerance and fair play on the North American continent to be the interpreter and reconciler of a new world. . . . If we fumble with our message in the world, what Science calls Progress and the Theologian God, will find another messenger."

D. McA.

DATE DUE

A fine of five cents will be charged for each day overdue.

MAR 4		
MAR 6		
JAN 25		
JUL 13		
MAY 3		
NOV 9		
JAN 1		
MAR 9		
JAN 31 1966		

Blunt

9.12.31

SIGN BOOK CARD

AND LEAVE AT
CHARGING DESK
IF BOOK IS TO BE USED
OUT OF THE
LIBRARY BUILDING

123707

1930

23707

AUG

NOV 1

JAN

FEB

MAR

JAN

Marky
(211.)

(grad.)
(S.S.)
(S.S.)
(S.S.)

pen

